

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIFIC PURPOSE LIDAR SURVEY




LiDAR, Breaklines and Contours for Bay County, Florida

State of Florida
Division of Emergency Management
Contract 07-HS-34-14-00-22-469
Task Order 20070525-492718a
PDS Task Order B

October 30, 2009

Prepared by:

Dewberry
8401 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, VA 22031-4666
for
Program & Data Solutions (PDS)
1625 Summit Lake Drive, Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32317



**Final Report of Specific Purpose LiDAR Survey, including
LiDAR-Generated Breaklines and Contours for Bay County, Florida
Contract 07-HS-34-14-00-22-469; T.O. No. 20070525-492718a, Task Order B**

For:
State of Florida
Division of Emergency Management
2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399


By:
Program & Data Solutions (PDS)
1625 Summit Lake Drive, Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32317

Prepared by:
David F. Maune, PhD, PSM, PS, GS, CP, CFM
Florida Professional Surveyor and Mapper No. LS6659
Dewberry
8401 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, VA 22031



Table of Contents

Type of Survey: Specific Purpose Survey.....	1
The PDS Team.....	2
Name of Company in Responsible Charge	3
Name of Responsible Surveyor	3
Survey Area	3
Map Reference.....	3
Summary of FDEM Baseline Specifications.....	3
Acronyms and Definitions.....	8
Ground Surveys and Dates	10
LiDAR Aerial Survey Areas and Dates	12
LiDAR Processing Methodology.....	12
LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Testing	13
LiDAR Horizontal Accuracy Testing	14
LiDAR Qualitative Assessments	15
Breakline Production Methodology.....	16
Contour Production Methodology	22
Breakline Qualitative Assessments.....	23
Contour Qualitative Assessments	24
Deliverables	24
References	25
General Notes	26
List of Appendices	27
Appendix A: County Project Tiling Footprint.....	28
Appendix B: County Geodetic Control Points	26
Appendix C: Data Dictionary	27
Appendix D: LiDAR Processing Report.....	51
Appendix E: QA/QC Checkpoints and Associated Discrepancies.....	68
Appendix F: LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Report	72
Appendix G: LiDAR Qualitative Assessment Report	84
Appendix H: Breakline/Contour Qualitative Assessment Report	98
Appendix I: Geodatabase Structure	106



Report of Specific Purpose LiDAR Survey, LiDAR-Generated Breaklines and Contours Bay County, Florida

Type of Survey: Specific Purpose Survey

This report pertains to a Specific Purpose LiDAR Survey of Bay County, Florida, conducted in the summer of 2007, and breaklines and contours generated in 2007 and 2008, for the Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM).


The LiDAR dataset, breaklines and contours were prepared by the Program and Data Solutions (PDS) team under FDEM contract 07-HS-34-14-00-22-469, Task Order 20070525-492718a (PDS Task Order B). The LiDAR dataset of Bay County was acquired by The Sanborn Map Company (Sanborn) in the summer of 2007 and processed to a bare-earth digital terrain model (DTM); it was produced to FDEM vertical accuracy specifications that differ from NOAA specifications in the adjoining LiDAR dataset of Walton County, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of FDEM and NOAA Vertical Accuracy Criteria

Vertical Accuracy Criteria	FDEM Specifications	NOAA Specifications
Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) at the 95% confidence level, in open terrain (non-vegetated) land cover only	$\leq 18.2\text{-cm}$ (0.60-ft) (based on RMSE_z of 9.25-cm x 1.9600)	$\leq 29.4\text{-cm}$ (0.96-ft) (based on RMSE_z of 15-cm x 1.9600)
Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) at the 95% confidence level, in all land cover categories combined	$\leq 36.3\text{-cm}$ (1.19-ft) (based on 95 th percentile) or RMSE_z of 18.5-cm x 1.9600	$\leq 36.3\text{-cm}$ (1.19-ft) (based on 95 th percentile) or RMSE_z of 18.5-cm x 1.9600

Under Task Order B, this is one of 12 similar county reports prepared by the PDS team of coastal areas along the Florida Panhandle, from Escambia County through Levy County, considered by FDEM to be vulnerable to hurricane tidal surges. Of these 12 reports, those for coastal Escambia, Santa Rosa, Walton and northern Bay County are based on LiDAR data previously acquired in support of the Northwest Florida Water Management District (NFWFMD) and produced to different accuracy specifications as indicated in Table 1 and to different point densities. The LiDAR datasets produced for Escambia, Santa Rosa and Walton counties were produced by three different NOAA contractors, but with independent QA/QC by Dewberry.

The reports for coastal areas of Bay County, as well as Okaloosa, Gulf, Franklin, Wakulla, Jefferson, Taylor, Dixie, and Levy counties are based on LiDAR data acquired in 2007 by the PDS team under the referenced FDEM contract, produced to the more-rigorous FDEM specifications. Detailed breaklines and contours were produced by the PDS team for areas to be mapped/improved as identified by a tile index provided by FDEM to PDS. Each tile covers an area of 5000 ft by 5000 ft. The map at Appendix A displays the 1074 tiles of Bay County for which LiDAR DTMs and LiDAR-derived breaklines and contours were produced by the PDS team under Task Order B. To avoid double counting, tiles on the county border with Walton County and Bay County were delivered only in one county dataset — whichever county included the majority of the area of each 5000 ft by 5000 ft tile.




Rather than describe only the data provided of Bay County in isolation, this report also explains the differences between LiDAR datasets acquired of Escambia, Santa Rosa and Walton counties and those of other counties in the Florida Panhandle produced to different specifications. In addition to the differences in vertical accuracy criteria, summarized in Table 1, there are also differences in the geodetic control used for the different contracts, and there are different point densities between the data acquired to NOAA specifications and data acquired to FDEM Baseline Specifications:

- For the nine new counties mapped by the PDS team for FDEM in the Florida Panhandle under Task Order B, a rigorous geodetic control network was established by the PDS team for all coastal counties between Okaloosa and Levy counties, but excluding Walton County which had been previously mapped by NOAA. Thus, the survey control used for Escambia, Santa Rosa, and Walton counties may differ from the geodetic control network established for the nine other counties in the Panhandle. Primarily because a rigorous geodetic control network was surveyed by the PDS team for the nine new counties, it is expected that there will be differences in the elevations of topographic surfaces between counties, primarily around the boundaries of Escambia, Santa Rosa and Walton counties where the 2006 LiDAR datasets, controlled to older survey control, merge with the 2007 LiDAR datasets controlled to the new geodetic control network established by the PDS team. Furthermore, northern Bay County was flown to the less-demanding NOAA specifications whereas southern Bay County was flown to the more-demanding FDEM specifications.
- For the nine new counties, including Bay County, the FDEM Baseline Specifications require a maximum post spacing of 4 feet, i.e., an average point density of less than 1 point per square meter. However, the PDS team required a much higher point density of its subcontractors in order to increase the probability of penetrating dense foliage during the mandated summer acquisition; with nominal post spacing of 0.7 meters per flight line and 50% sidelap between flight lines, the average point density is 4 points per square meter. The NOAA specifications for Escambia County, Santa Rosa County, Walton County, and northern Bay County, required a nominal post spacing of 2 meters, yielding an average point density of 0.25 points per square meter. The significance of this difference is that the nine new counties acquired for FDEM, including southern Bay County, have LiDAR point densities approximately 16 times higher than the LiDAR point densities in Escambia County, Santa Rosa County, Walton County, and northern Bay County. With higher point density there is a greater probability of penetrating dense vegetation and minimizing areas defined as “low confidence areas.”

The PDS Team

PDS is a Joint Venture consisting of PBS&J, Dewberry, and URS Corp:

- PBS&J provided local client liaison in Tallahassee. PBS&J was also responsible for the overall ground survey effort including management of field survey subcontractors — Allen Nobles & Associates, Inc. (ANA) and Diversified Design & Drafting Services, Inc. (3DS) — which performed the geodetic control surveys and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) checkpoint surveys used for independent accuracy testing by Dewberry and URS. These surveyors executed a network adjustment of control points used throughout the Florida Panhandle. It was important to execute this network adjustment because of widely-held concerns that the survey control was deficient in the Florida Panhandle counties. Mr. Glenn Bryan, PSM, of PBS&J, and Mr. Brett Wood, PSM, of 3DS, were the technical leads for the control surveys and QA/QC surveys.



- Dewberry was responsible for the overall Work Plan and aerial survey effort for the nine new counties, including management of LiDAR subcontractors that performed the LiDAR data acquisition and post-processing and produced LAS classified data. A staff of QA/QC specialists at Dewberry's Fairfax (VA) office performed quality assessments of the breaklines and contours. Dewberry served as the single point of contact with FDEM. Dr. David Maune, PSM, was Dewberry's technical lead for the digital orthophoto and LiDAR surveys and derived products. Under separate contract with NOAA, Dr. Maune had previously served as Dewberry's Quality Manager for its independent QA/QC of LiDAR data produced by NOAA for the NFWFMD of Escambia, Santa Rosa, and Walton counties. Dewberry did not perform QA/QC of the existing LiDAR dataset of northern Bay County.
- URS Corp. was responsible for data management and information management. URS developed the GeoCue Distributed Production Management System (DPMS), managed and tracked the flow of data, performed independent accuracy testing and quality assessments of FDEM's new LiDAR data acquired in 2007, tracked and reported the status of individual tiles during production, and produced all final deliverables for FDEM. Mr. Robert Ryan, CP, of URS, was the technical lead for this effort.

Name of Company in Responsible Charge

Dewberry
8401 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, VA 22031-4666

Name of Responsible Surveyor

David F. Maune, PhD, PSM, PS, GS, CP, CFM
Florida Professional Surveyor and Mapper (PSM) No. LS6659

Survey Area

The project area for this report encompasses approximately 963 square miles within Bay County and small adjoining areas of Walton County, Washington County, and Gulf County.


Map Reference

There are no hardcopy map sheets for this project. The map at Appendix A provides graphical reference to the 5000-ft x 5000-ft tiles covered by this report.

Summary of FDEM Baseline Specifications

All new data produced for FDEM under the referenced contract are required to satisfy the Florida Baseline Specifications, included as appendices to PDS's Task Order B, dated May 23, 2007, from FDEM. To expedite production, the Florida Baseline Specifications were modified by FDEM to require new LiDAR data acquisition during the summer of 2007 (leaf-on) as opposed to the normal leaf-off.

Task Order B presented demanding technical challenges for the PDS team because the existing geodetic control monuments in the Florida Panhandle are believed to be the most inaccurate in Florida, with elevation discrepancies as much as several feet; and some areas in the Panhandle are subject to subsidence. LiDAR elevations produced relative to some survey control monuments are believed to differ by as much as several feet from LiDAR elevations produced relative to other control monuments in



the Panhandle. This caused a new geodetic control network to be established by the PDS team for the counties to be newly surveyed, but without adjusting the geodetic control monuments used for Escambia County, Santa Rosa County, Walton County, and northern Bay County for which existing LiDAR data was used “as is.”

The official State Plane Coordinate System tiling scheme was provided by FDEM to the PDS team on July 10, 2007 for Florida’s North Zone and West Zone. The Bay County tiling footprint graphic is shown at Appendix A.

The Florida Baseline Specifications required the LiDAR data to be collected using an approved sensor with a maximum field of view (FOV) of 20° on either side of nadir, with GPS baseline distances limited to 20 miles, with maximum post spacing of 4 feet in unobscured areas for random point data, and with vertical root mean square error ($RMSE_z$) ≤ 0.30 ft and Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) ≤ 0.60 ft at the 95% confidence level in open terrain (bare-earth and low grass); this accuracy is equivalent to 1 ft contours in open terrain when tested in accordance with the National Map Accuracy Standard (NMAS). In other land cover categories (brush lands and low trees, forested areas fully covered by trees, and urban areas), the Florida Baseline Specifications required the LiDAR data’s $RMSE_z$ to be ≤ 0.61 ft with Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) and Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) ≤ 1.19 ft at the 95% confidence level; this accuracy is equivalent to 2 ft contours when tested in accordance with the NMAS. *Low confidence areas*, originally called *obscured vegetated areas*, are defined for areas where the vertical data may not meet the data accuracy requirements due to heavy vegetation.


The Florida Baseline Specifications also required the horizontal accuracy to meet or exceed 3.8 feet at the 95% confidence level, using $RMSE_r \times 1.7308$. This means that the horizontal (radial) RMSE ($RMSE_r$) must meet or exceed 2.20 ft. This is the horizontal accuracy required of maps compiled at a scale of 1:1,200 (1” = 100’) in accordance with the traditional National Map Accuracy Standard.

To meet and exceed these specifications for the nine new county LiDAR datasets, the PDS team established the following more-rigorous specifications for its LiDAR subcontractors:

- Instead of a 20° FOV on either side of nadir, the PDS team limited the FOV to 18°
- Instead of GPS baselines ≤ 20 miles, the PDS team limited baseline lengths to ≤ 20 km, except in one small isolated area where the baseline length was approximately 23 km (14 miles).
- Instead of 4 foot post spacing which yields an average of 0.67 points per m^2 , the PDS team chose 0.7 m point spacing and 50% sidalap that yields an average of more than 4 points per m^2 . Thus, the PDS team’s average point density is nearly 6 times higher than required by FDEM, greatly increasing the probability of LiDAR points penetrating through dense vegetation so as to minimize areas defined as *low confidence areas*. The PDS team defines *low confidence areas* as vegetated areas of $\frac{1}{2}$ acre or larger that are considered obscured to the extent that adequate vertical data cannot be clearly determined to accurately define the DTM. Such areas indicate where the vertical data may not meet the data accuracy requirements due to heavy vegetation.

The first deliverable is LiDAR mass points, delivered to LAS 1.1 specifications, including the following LAS classification codes:

- Class 1 = Unclassified, and used for all other features that do not fit into the Classes 2, 7, 9, or 12, including vegetation, buildings, etc.
- Class 2 = Ground, includes accurate LiDAR points in overlapping flight lines
- Class 7 = Noise, includes LiDAR points in overlapping flight lines



- Class 9 = Water, includes LiDAR points in overlapping flight lines
- Class 12 = Overlap, including areas of overlapping flight lines which have been deliberately removed from Class 1 because of their reduced accuracy.

Table 2 compares the LiDAR LAS classes specified by the FDEM and NOAA specifications.

Table 2. Comparison of FDEM and NOAA LAS Classes

FDEM LAS Classes	NOAA LAS Classes
Class 1 – Unclassified, including vegetation, buildings, bridges, piers	Class 1 – Unclassified
Class 2 – Ground points (used for contours)	Class 2 – Ground points (used for contours)
Class 7 – Noise	Class 9 – Water
Class 9 – Water ¹	
Class 12 – Overlap points deliberately removed	

For each 500 square mile area within the nine new county datasets, a total of 120 “blind” QA/QC checkpoints were surveyed, totally unknown to (i.e., “blind” from) the LiDAR subcontractors. Each set of 120 QA/QC checkpoints had the goal to include 30 checkpoints in each of the following four land cover categories:


- Category 1 = bare-earth and low grass
- Category 2 = brush lands and low trees
- Category 3 = forested areas fully covered by trees
- Category 4 = urban areas

In a few cases, there were insufficient dispersed areas to acquire 30 QA/QC checkpoints for one or more land cover categories; when this occurred, Dewberry advised the surveyors to select additional QA/QC checkpoints for land cover categories that were predominant in the area and therefore more representative of the area being tested.

The following vertical accuracy guidelines were specified by the Florida Baseline Specifications:

- In category 1, the $RMSE_z$ must be ≤ 0.30 ft ($Accuracy_z \leq 0.60$ ft at the 95% confidence level); $Accuracy_z$ in Category 1 refers to Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) which defines how accurate the elevation data are when not complicated by asphalt or vegetation that may cause elevations to be either lower or higher than the bare earth terrain. This is equivalent to the accuracy expected of 1 ft contours in non-vegetated terrain.
- In category 2, the $RMSE_z$ must be ≤ 0.61 ft ($Accuracy_z \leq 1.19$ ft at the 95% confidence level); $Accuracy_z$ in Category 2 refers to Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) in brush lands and low trees and defines how accurate the elevation data are when complicated by such vegetation that

¹ Infrared radiation from LiDAR is partially absorbed by water, and all elevations in LAS Class 9 should be recognized as unreliable and treated accordingly.



frequently causes elevations to be lower or higher than the bare earth terrain. This is equivalent to the accuracy expected of 2 ft contours in such terrain.


- In category 3, the $RMSE_z$ must be ≤ 0.61 ft ($Accuracy_z \leq 1.19$ ft at the 95% confidence level); $Accuracy_z$ in Category 3 refers to Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) in forested areas fully covered by trees and defines how accurate the elevation data are when complicated by such vegetation that frequently causes elevations to be lower or higher than the bare earth terrain. This is equivalent to the accuracy expected of 2 ft contours in such terrain.
- In category 4, the $RMSE_z$ must be ≤ 0.61 ft ($Accuracy_z \leq 1.19$ ft at the 95% confidence level); $Accuracy_z$ in Category 4 refers to Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) in urban areas typically paved with asphalt and defines how accurate the elevation data are when complicated by asphalt that frequently causes elevations to be lower than the bare earth terrain. This is equivalent to the accuracy expected of 2 ft contours in such terrain.
- In all land cover categories combined, the $RMSE_z$ must be ≤ 0.61 ft ($Accuracy_z \leq 1.19$ ft at the 95% confidence level); $Accuracy_z$ in all categories combined refers to Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA).
- The terms FVA, SVA and CVA are explained in Chapter 3, *Accuracy Standards & Guidelines*, of “Digital Elevation Model Technologies and Applications: The DEM Users Manual,” published by the American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS), January, 2007.

A second major deliverable consists of nine types of breaklines, produced in accordance with the PDS team’s Data Dictionary at Appendix C:

1. Coastal shoreline features
2. Single-line hydrographic features
3. Dual-line hydrographic features
4. Closed water body features
5. Road edge-of-pavement features
6. Bridge and overpass features
7. Soft breakline features
8. Island features
9. Low confidence areas

Another major deliverable includes both one-foot and two-foot contours, produced from the mass points and breaklines, certified to meet or exceed NSSDA standards for one-foot contours. Two-foot contours within obscured vegetated areas are not required to meet NSSDA standards. These contours were also produced in accordance with the PDS team’s Data Dictionary at Appendix C.

Table 3 is included below for ease in understanding the accuracy requirements when comparing the traditional National Map Accuracy Standard (NMAS) and the newer National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA). This table is extracted from Table 13.2 of “Digital Elevation Model Technologies and Applications: The DEM Users Manual,” published in January, 2007 by ASPRS. The traditional NMAS uses Vertical Map Accuracy Standard (VMAS) to define vertical accuracy at the 90% confidence level, whereas the NSSDA uses $Accuracy_z$ to define vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level. Both the VMAS and $Accuracy_z$ are computed with different multipliers for the very same $RMSE_z$ value which represents vertical accuracy at the 68% confidence level for each equivalent contour interval specified.



The term Accuracy_z (vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level) is comparable to the terms described below as Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA), Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) and Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) which also define vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level. In open (non-vegetated) terrain, Accuracy_z is exactly the same as FVA (both computed as RMSE_z x 1.9600) because there is no logical justification for elevation errors to depart from a normal error distribution. In vegetated areas, vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level (Accuracy_z) can also be computed as RMSE_z x 1.9600; however, because vertical errors do not always have a normal error distribution in vegetated terrain, alternative guidelines from the National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP) and American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS) allow the 95th percentile method to be used (as with the CVA and SVA) to report the vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level in land cover categories other than open terrain.

Table 3. Comparison of NMAS/NSSDA Vertical Accuracy

NMAS Equivalent Contour Interval	NMAS VMAS (90 percent confidence level)	NSSDA RMSE _z (68 percent confidence level)	NSSDA Accuracy _z (95 percent confidence level)
1 ft	0.5 ft	0.30 ft or 9.25 cm	0.60 ft or 18.2 cm
2 ft	1.0 ft	0.61 ft or 18.5 cm	1.19 ft or 36.3 cm

The next major deliverable includes metadata compliant with the Federal Geographic Data Committee's (FGDC) Content Standard for Spatial Metadata in an ArcCatalog-compatible XML format. Copies of all survey reports, including this Report of Specific Purpose LiDAR Survey, must be delivered in PDF format as attachments to the metadata.

The last major deliverable includes the Vertical Accuracy Report of Bay County, based on independent comparison of the LiDAR data with the QA/QC checkpoints, surveyed and tested in accordance with guidelines of the National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA), American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP), and using the QA/QC checkpoints surveyed by Dewberry and listed at Appendix E.

Instead of delivering one vertical accuracy report, using 120 QA/QC checkpoints for each 500 square miles of the project area, separate reports are delivered for each county. Therefore, individual county vertical accuracy reports may be based on fewer than or more than 120 QA/QC checkpoints, depending on whether the area mapped in each county is smaller than or larger than 500 square miles. Regardless, the average density of QA/QC checkpoints remains the same on average for each countywide report.

Datums and Coordinates: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83)/HARN for horizontal coordinates and North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88) for vertical coordinates. All coordinates are Florida State Plane Coordinate System (SPCS) in U.S. Survey Feet. All counties listed are in the Florida SPCS North Zone, except for Levy County which is delivered in both Florida SPCS North and West Zones. Levy County is normally in the West Zone but the LiDAR data are also delivered in the North Zone for ease in merger with all Panhandle counties for SLOSH modeling of all counties from Escambia through Levy.

Appendix I to this report provides the Geodatabase structure for all digital vector deliverables in Bay County.




Acronyms and Definitions

3DS	Diversified Design & Drafting Services, Inc.
Accuracy _r	Horizontal (radial) accuracy at the 95% confidence level, defined by the NSSDA
Accuracy _z	Vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level, defined by the NSSDA
ANA	Allen Nobles & Associates, Inc.
ASFPM	Association of State Floodplain Managers
ASPRS	American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing
CFM	Certified Floodplain Manager (ASFPM)
CMAS	Circular Map Accuracy Standard, defined by the NMAS
CP	Certified Photogrammetrist (ASPRS)
CVA	Consolidated Vertical Accuracy, defined by the NDEP and ASPRS
DEM	Digital Elevation Model (gridded DTM)
DTM	Digital Terrain Model (mass points and breaklines to map the bare earth terrain)
DSM	Digital Surface Model (top reflective surface, includes treetops and rooftops)
FDEM	Florida Division of Emergency Management
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FGDC	Federal Geographic Data Committee
FOV	Field of View
FVA	Fundamental Vertical Accuracy, defined by the NDEP and ASPRS
GS	Geodetic Surveyor
GIS	Geographic Information System Surveyor
LAS	LiDAR data format as defined by ASPRS
LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LMSI	Laser Mapping Specialists Inc.
MHHW	Mean Higher High Water
MHW	Mean High Water, defines official shoreline in Florida
MLLW	Mean Lower Low Water
MLW	Mean Low Water
MSL	Mean Sea Level
NAD 83	North American Datum of 1983
NAVD 88	North American Vertical Datum of 1988
NDEP	National Digital Elevation Program
NMAS	National Map Accuracy Standard
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NSSDA	National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy
NSRS	National Spatial Reference System
NWFWMD	Northwest Florida Water Management District
PDS	Program & Data Solutions, joint venture between PBS&J, Dewberry and URS Corp
PS	Photogrammetric Surveyor
PSM	Professional Surveyor and Mapper (Florida)
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
RMSE _h	Vertical Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of ellipsoid heights
RMSE _r	Horizontal (radial) Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) computed from RMSE _x and RMSE _y
RMSE _z	Vertical Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of orthometric heights
SLOSH	Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes
SRWMD	Suwannee River Water Management District
SVA	Supplemental Vertical Accuracy, defined by the NDEP and ASPRS



TIN
VMAS

Triangulated Irregular Network
Vertical Map Accuracy Standard, defined by the NNAS



Ground Surveys and Dates

Past experience with control in the Florida Panhandle area indicated a need to improve the accuracy of the existing survey monuments. For the nine newly-mapped counties in the Florida Panhandle, including Bay County, the PDS team established a geodetic control network to provide accurate and consistent horizontal and vertical control for LiDAR and photogrammetric mapping using GPS technology. The project consisted of a Primary and two Secondary control networks supporting the mapping of approximately 6,113 square miles located in Northwest Florida. PBS&J managed the overall ground survey effort including management of field survey subcontractors, Allen Nobles & Associates, Inc. (ANA) and Diversified Design & Drafting Services, Inc. (3DS), which performed control surveys and QA/QC checkpoint surveys used for independent accuracy testing, and executed a network adjustment of control points used throughout the Florida panhandle.

The Primary network stations (see Figure 1) were used as base stations supporting the airborne GPS data acquisition, and as a consistent control framework for the more densely spaced Secondary control networks, and all subsequent control surveying activity on the project. They were setup at 40 kilometer spacing per the 2 centimeter requirements for Primary Control stated in the NOS NGS-58. The Primary Control network consisted of 55 stations, including 10 Continuously Operating Reference Stations (CORS), 27 existing monuments from the National Spatial Reference System (NSRS) and 18 new monuments set so as to limit LiDAR GPS baseline lengths to 20 Km relative to GPS base stations on either side of stations spaced ≈ 40 Km apart. Third order differential leveling was used to establish elevations on 20 Primary network stations in specific areas where published vertical stations could not be occupied directly with GPS. A minimally constrained (free) Least Squares adjustment was run to verify the internal accuracy of the Primary network. After evaluating and removing any outliers, a final free adjustment was generated, consisting of 191 independent vectors. The input error estimates were scaled by a factor of 14.90 which resulted in a properly weighted adjustment with a variance factor of 1.0154, with no flagged residuals. A constrained (fixed) 3-D horizontal adjustment was run using the same input error estimates as were used in the free adjustment; the variance factor was 1.3712 and there were no flagged residuals. A constrained (fixed) 1-D vertical adjustment was run using the same input error estimates as were used in the free adjustment; Station BE3991 was fixed in latitude, longitude and orthometric height; the variance factor was 1.2866 and there were no flagged residuals.




Figure 1. Primary Control Network

The Secondary network stations (see Figure 2) were used to support the measurement of both LiDAR and orthophoto QA/QC checkpoint sites. They were setup at 15 kilometer spacing per the 2 centimeter requirements for Secondary Control stated in NOS NGS-58.

The first Secondary Control network consisted of 4 stations in the Okaloosa County area. The second Secondary Control network consisted of all remaining mapping areas in the Florida Panhandle. The Secondary Control networks included a total of 80 control points, including 16 recovered NSRS monuments, 2 recovered DNR monuments, and 62 new monuments set for this network. A minimally constrained (free) Least Squares adjustment was run to verify the internal accuracy of the Secondary networks. After evaluating and removing any outliers, a final free adjustment was generated. This final free adjustment consisted of 254 independent vectors. The input error estimates were scaled by a factor of 6.234, which resulted in a properly weighted adjustment with a variance factor of 1.000; there were no flagged residuals. A constrained (fixed) 3-D horizontal adjustment was run using the same input error estimates as were used in the free adjustment; the variance factor was 1.6339 and there were six flagged residuals. A constrained (fixed) 1-D vertical adjustment was run using the same input error estimates as were used in the free adjustment; Station BE3991 was fixed in latitude, longitude and orthometric height; the variance factor was 1.2136 and there were no flagged residuals.




Figure 2. Secondary Control Networks

These GPS ground surveys were executed between May and September 2007. Full details are documented in 3DS's "Final Report of Geodetic Control Survey for LiDAR and Photogrammetry, Northwest Florida," dated March 13, 2008.


The QA/QC checkpoints used for this county are listed at Appendix E.

LiDAR Aerial Survey Areas and Dates

Sanborn collected the LiDAR data for Bay County during the summer of 2007.

LiDAR Processing Methodology

A LiDAR processing report from Sanborn is included at Appendix D.



LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Testing

URS performed the LiDAR vertical accuracy assessment for Bay County in accordance with *ASPRS Guidelines, Vertical Accuracy Reporting for Lidar Data*, May 24, 2004, and Section 1.5 of the *Guidelines for Digital Elevation Data*, published by the National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP), May 10, 2004. These guidelines call for the mandatory determination of Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) and Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA), and the optional determination of Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA). NOAA's accuracy specifications are compared with FDEM's accuracy specifications at Table 1. NOAA's checkpoint requirements are compared with FDEM's checkpoint requirements at Table 4.


Table 4. Comparison of FDEM and NOAA Checkpoint Requirements

	FDEM Specifications	NOAA Specifications
Land cover categories tested by QA/QC checkpoints	Four land cover categories tested: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open terrain; bare-earth, low grass 2. Brush lands and low trees 3. Forested areas 4. Urban, built-up areas 	Five land cover categories tested: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open terrain; bare-earth, low grass 2. Weeds and crops 3. Scrub 4. Forested areas 5. Urban, built-up areas
Number of checkpoints per category	20 checkpoints, per category, for each 500 square mile area	20 checkpoints, per category, for each countywide dataset

The LiDAR dataset of Bay County, delivered in March of 2008, passed the accuracy testing by URS as documented at Appendices E and F.

Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) is determined with QA/QC checkpoints located only in open terrain (grass, dirt, sand, and rocks) where there is a high probability that the LiDAR sensor detected the bare-earth ground surface, and where errors are expected to follow a normal error distribution. With a normal error distribution, the FVA at the 95 percent confidence level is computed as the vertical root mean square error ($RMSE_z$) of the checkpoints $\times 1.9600$. The FVA is the same as $Accuracy_z$ at the 95% confidence level (for open terrain), as specified in Appendix 3-A of the *National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy*, FGDC-STD-007.3-1998, see <http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/FGDC-standards-projects/accuracy/part3/chapter3>. For FDEM, including southern Bay County, the FVA standard is .60 feet, corresponding to an $RMSE_z$ of 0.30 feet or 9.25 cm, the accuracy expected from 1-foot contours. For northern Bay County, the FVA standard is 0.96 feet, corresponding to an $RMSE_z$ of 15 cm, better than the $RMSE_z$ of 18.5 cm expected from 2-foot contours. ***In Bay County, the $RMSE_z$ in bare earth and low grass equaled 0.30 ft compared with the 0.30 ft specification of FDEM; and the FVA computed using $RMSE_z \times 1.9600$ was equal to 0.59 ft, compared with the 0.60 ft specification of FDEM.***

Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) is determined with all checkpoints, representing open terrain and all other land cover categories combined. If errors follow a normal error distribution, the CVA can be computed by multiplying the consolidated $RMSE_z$ by 1.9600. However, because bare-earth elevation errors often vary based on the height and density of vegetation, a normal error distribution cannot be assumed, and $RMSE_z$ cannot necessarily be used to calculate the 95 percent confidence level. Instead, a nonparametric testing method, based on the 95th percentile, may be used to determine CVA at the 95 percent confidence level. NDEP guidelines state that errors larger than the 95th percentile should be



documented in the quality control report and project metadata. For FDEM, the CVA specification for all classes combined should be less than or equal to 1.19 feet; this same CVA specification was used by NOAA. *In southern Bay County, the CVA computed using $RMSE_z \times 1.9600$ was equal to 0.86 ft, compared with the 1.19 ft specification of FDEM; and the CVA computed using the 95th percentile was also equal to 0.86 ft. URS determined that the dataset passed the CVA standard.*

Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) is determined separately for each individual land cover category, recognizing that the LiDAR sensor and post-processing may not have mapped the bare-earth ground surface, and that errors may not follow a normal error distribution. SVA specifications are “target” values and not mandatory, recognizing that larger errors in some categories are offset by smaller errors in other land cover categories, so long as the overall mandatory CVA specification is satisfied. For each land cover category, the SVA at the 95 percent confidence level equals the 95th percentile error for all checkpoints in that particular land cover category. For FDEM’s specification, the SVA target is 1.19 feet for each category; this same SVA target specification was used by NOAA. *In southern Bay County, the SVA tested as 0.52 ft in bare earth and low grass, 0.95 ft in brush and low trees, 0.87 ft in forested areas, and 0.84 ft in urban terrain. All of these four land cover categories met their target value of 1.19 ft or less.*


The complete LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Report for Bay County is at Appendix F.

LiDAR Horizontal Accuracy Testing

The LiDAR data was compiled to meet 3.8 feet horizontal accuracy at the 95% confidence level.

Whereas FDEM baseline specifications call for horizontal accuracy testing, traditional horizontal accuracy testing of LiDAR data is not cost effective for the following reasons:

- Paragraphs 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) states: “Horizontal accuracy shall be tested by comparing the planimetric coordinates of well-defined points in the dataset with coordinates of the same points from an independent source of higher accuracy ... when a dataset, e.g., a gridded digital elevation dataset or elevation contour dataset does not contain well-defined points, label for vertical accuracy only.” Similarly, in Appendix 3-C of the NSSDA, paragraph 1 explains well-defined points as follows: “A well-defined point represents a feature for which the horizontal position is known to a high degree of accuracy and position with respect to the geodetic datum. For the purpose of accuracy testing, well-defined points must be easily visible or recoverable on the ground, on the independent source of higher accuracy, and on the product itself. Graphic contour data and digital hypsographic data may not contain well-defined points.”
- Paragraph 1.5.3.4 of the *Guidelines for Digital Elevation Data*, published in 2004 by the National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP), states: “The NDEP does not require independent testing of horizontal accuracy for elevation products. When the lack of distinct surface features makes horizontal accuracy testing of mass points, TINs, or DEMs difficult or impossible, the data producer should specify horizontal accuracy using the following statement: *Compiled to meet ___ (meters, feet) horizontal accuracy at 95 percent confidence level.*”
- Paragraph 1.2, Horizontal Accuracy, of *ASPRS Guidelines, Vertical Accuracy Reporting for Lidar Data*, published by the American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote



Sensing (ASPRS) in 2004, further explains why it is difficult and impractical to test the horizontal accuracy of LiDAR data, and explains why ASPRS does not require horizontal accuracy testing of LiDAR-derived elevation products.

- ASPRS has been actively seeking to develop cost-effective techniques to use LiDAR intensity imagery to test the horizontal accuracy of LiDAR data. As recently as May 1, 2008, at the annual conference of ASPRS, the most relevant technique for doing so was in a paper entitled “New Horizontal Accuracy Assessment Tools and Techniques for Lidar Data,” presented by the Ohio DOT. Whereas the technique had research value, it was neither practical nor affordable for use in horizontal accuracy testing of FDEM data.
- Appendix A of FDEM’s Baseline Specifications require 20 horizontal test points for every 500 square mile area of digital orthophotos to be produced, and Appendix B of FDEM’s Baseline Specifications requires 120 vertical test points for each 500 square mile area of LiDAR data to be produced. The PDS task orders included no funding for the more-expensive horizontal checkpoints that would be certain to appear on LiDAR intensity images as clearly-defined point features.
- In addition to LiDAR system factory calibration of horizontal and vertical accuracy, each of the PDS team’s LiDAR subcontractors have different techniques for field calibration checks used to determine if bore-sighting is still accurate. Sanborn’s technique, used for Bay County, is explained at Appendix D. Sanborn’s field calibration tests indicated the horizontal accuracy tested 1.538 feet at the 95 percent confidence level, well within FDEM’s 3.8 foot specification.

LiDAR Qualitative Assessments


URS also performed the LiDAR qualitative assessment.

An assessment of the vertical accuracy alone does not yield a complete picture with regard to the usability of LiDAR data for its intended purpose. It is very possible for a given set of LiDAR data to meet the accuracy requirements, yet still contain artifacts (non-ground points) in the bare-earth surface, or a lack of ground points in some areas that may render the data, in whole or in part, unsuitable for certain applications.

Based on the extremely large volume of elevation points generated, it is neither time efficient, cost effective, nor technically practical to produce a perfectly clean (artifact-free) bare-earth terrain surface. The purpose of the LiDAR Qualitative Assessment Report (see Appendix G) is to provide a qualitative analysis of the “cleanliness” of the bare-earth terrain surface for use in supporting riverine and coastal analysis, modeling, and mapping.

The main software programs used by URS in performing the bare-earth data cleanliness review include the following:

- *GeoCue*: a geospatial data/process management system especially suited to managing large LiDAR data sets
- *TerraModeler*: used for analysis and visualization
- *TerraScan*: runs inside of MicroStation; used for point classification and points file generation
- *GeoCue LAS EQC*: is also used for data analysis and edit



The following systematic approach was followed by URS in performing the cleanliness review and analysis:


- Uploaded data to the GeoCue data warehouse (enhanced data management)
 - LiDAR: cut the data into uniform tiles measuring 5,000 feet by 5,000 feet – using the State Plane tile index provided by FDEM
 - Imagery: Best available orthophotography was used to facilitate the data review. Additional LiDAR Orthos were created from the LiDAR intensity data and used for review purposes.
- Performed coverage/gap check to ensure proper coverage of the project area
 - Created a large post grid (~30 meters) from the bare-earth points, which was used to identify any holes or gaps in the data coverage.
- Performed tile-by-tile analyses
 - Using TerraScan and LAS EQC, checked for gross errors in profile mode (noise, high and low points)
 - Reviewed each tile for anomalies; identified problem areas with a polygon, annotated comment, and screenshot as needed for clarification and illustration. Used ortho imagery when necessary to aid in making final determinations with regards to:
 - Buildings left in the bare-earth points file
 - Vegetation left in the bare-earth points file
 - Water points left in the bare-earth points file
 - Proper definition of roads
 - Bridges and large box culverts removed from the bare-earth points file
 - Areas that may have been “shaved off” or “over-smoothed” during the auto-filtering process
- Prepared and sent the error reports to LiDAR firm for correction
- Reviewed revisions and comments from the LiDAR firm
- Prepared and submitted final reports to FDEM

The LiDAR data of Bay County was processed to a bare-earth terrain surface by Sanborn. The initial LiDAR dataset provided to URS for accuracy and qualitative assessment failed for three reasons: (1) systematic errors in vertical accuracy, (2) elevation offsets between flight lines and “cornrows” that exceeded the 20-cm criteria used by the LiDAR industry, and (3) excessive noise, artifacts and anomalies. The data was reprocessed and the revised dataset passed URS’s qualitative assessment as reported at Appendix G.

Breakline Production Methodology

For the *hard breaklines*, Sanborn used GeoCue software to develop LiDAR stereo models of Bay County so the LiDAR derived data could be viewed in 3-D stereo using Socet Set softcopy photogrammetric software. Using LiDARgrammetry procedures with LiDAR intensity imagery, Sanborn stereo-compiled the eight types of *hard breaklines* in accordance with the Data Dictionary at Appendix C.

For the *soft hydro breaklines*, Dewberry used 2.5-D techniques to digitize soft, linear hydrographic features first in 2-D and then used its GeoFIRM toolkit to drape the soft breaklines over the ESRI Terrain to derive the Z-values (elevations), also consistent with the Data Dictionary at Appendix C. All breakline compilation was performed under the direct supervision of an ASPRS Certified Photogrammetrist and Florida Professional Surveyor and Mapper (PSM). The breaklines conform with data format requirements outlined by the FDEM Baseline Specifications.



Whereas flowing rivers and streams are “hydro-enforced” to depict the downward flow of water, dry drainage features are not “hydro-enforced” but deliberately include undulations that more-accurately represent the true topography. This is, in fact, the ideal situation for topographic mapping.

The five figures below demonstrate how the PDS team’s high LiDAR point density (4 points per square meter) are used to penetrate dense vegetation and accurately map the dry drainage feature not visible from a normal digital orthophoto (Figure 1); the total density of the LiDAR point cloud (Figure 2); the density of LAS Class 2 points that penetrated to the ground (Figure 3); the color-coded Terrain to help in visualizing the variable elevations (Figure 4); and the soft hydro breakline that approximates the potential flow line of the dry drainage feature and the contours that clearly show the undulations in the Terrain (Figure 5). At Figure 5, the 9-foot contour lines are *depression contours* that surround elevation points that are lower than 9-feet. Although the undulations, by definition, are not “hydro-enforced,” the PDS Team’s PSM in responsible charge of this project considers it a violation of professional standards if one were to deliberately degrade the accurate Terrain, soft hydro breakline and contours in a dry drainage feature in order to “hydro-enforce” that feature by filling the depressions and falsely scalping off the higher undulations in order to make an idealized monotonic dry streambed out of the true undulating streambed. To “hydro-enforce” such a dry streambed would be to falsify the true topography of naturally undulating terrain. The soft hydro breaklines are part of the hydrographic feature class, but have a separate sub-class code, 3. This enables hydro-enforced hydrographic features, sub-class codes 1 and 2 for single and dual lines, to be distinguished from these non-hydro-enforced soft hydrographic features representing dry drainage features.




Figure 3. Even in very dense vegetation, the PDS team's high LiDAR point density (4 points per square meter) enabled the detection of dry drainage features beneath the vegetation.





Figure 4. Full point cloud with profile (below) showing density of vegetation in the area of the dry drainage feature.






Figure 5. LAS Class 2 (ground) points showing the high density of points that penetrated the vegetation.




Figure 6. The ESRI Terrain is color-coded to depict the variable elevation bands. This clearly shows the lower, undulating elevations in the dry drainage feature.





Figure 7. This figure shows variable “invert elevations” along the soft hydro breakline. It also shows “depression contours” where water would normally puddle if the drainage feature was only half dry. The soft hydro breakline passing through the “depression contours” clearly depict elevations lower than the 9-foot contour lines.


Contour Production Methodology

Sanborn used proprietary procedures to generate accurate contours from the LiDAR and breakline data. Using the LiDAR, a digital elevation model is filtered and further interpolated as a triangulated irregular network (TIN) of points. The TIN is rasterized to an ESRI GRID format and with the compiled breaklines, the 2-foot and 1-foot contours are generated and in accordance with the Data Dictionary at Appendix C. The contours conform to data format Requirements outlined by the FDEM Baseline Specifications.



Breakline Qualitative Assessments

Dewberry performed the breakline qualitative assessments. The following workflow diagram represents the steps taken by Dewberry to provide a thorough qualitative assessment of the breakline data.




In order to ensure a correct database format, Dewberry provided all subcontractors with geodatabase shells containing the required feature classes in the required format. Upon receipt of the data, Dewberry verified that the correct shell was used and validated the topology rules associated with it.

Feature Class	Rule	Feature Class
SOFTFEATURE	Must Not Intersect	
OVERPASS	Must Not Intersect	
ROADBREAKLINE	Must Not Intersect	
HYDROGRAPHIC...	Must Not Intersect	
SOFTFEATURE	Must Not Overlap With	ROADBREAKLINE
SOFTFEATURE	Must Not Overlap With	HYDROGRAPHICF
ROADBREAKLINE	Must Not Overlap With	HYDROGRAPHICF
SOFTFEATURE	Must Not Self-Intersect	
OVERPASS	Must Not Self-Intersect	
ROADBREAKLINE	Must Not Self-Intersect	
HYDROGRAPHIC...	Must Not Self-Intersect	

Figure 8. Breaklines topology rules

Then automated checks are applied on hydrofeatures to validate the 3D connectivity of the feature and the monotonicity of the hydrographic breaklines. Dewberry's major concern was that the hydrographic breaklines have a continuous flow downhill and that breaklines do not undulate. Error points are generated at each vertex not complying with the tested rules and these potential edit calls are then visually validated during the visual evaluation of the data. This step also helped validate that breakline vertices did not have excessive minimum or maximum elevations and that elevations are consistent with adjacent vertex elevations.

The next step is to compare the elevation of the breakline vertices against the elevation extracted from the TIN built from the LiDAR ground points, keeping in mind that a discrepancy is expected because of the




hydro-enforcement applied to the breaklines and because of the interpolated imagery used to acquire the breaklines. A given tolerance is used to validate if the elevations do not differ too much from the LiDAR.

Dewberry's final check for the breaklines was to perform a full qualitative analysis of the breaklines. Dewberry compared the breaklines against LiDAR intensity images to ensure breaklines were captured in the required locations.

Contour Qualitative Assessments

Dewberry also performed the qualitative assessments of the contours using the following workflow.



Upon receipt of each delivery area, the first step performed by Dewberry was a series of data topology validations. Dewberry checked for the following instances in the data:

1. Contours must not overlap
2. Contours must not intersect
3. Contours must not have dangles (except at project boundary)
4. Contours must not self-overlap
5. Contours must not self-intersect

After the topology and geodatabase format validation was complete, Dewberry checked the elevation attribute of each contour to ensure NULL values are not included. Finally, Dewberry loaded the contour data plus the Lidar intensity images into ArcGIS and performed a full qualitative review of the contour data for smoothness and consistency of feature codes.


Appendix H summarizes Dewberry's qualitative assessments of the breaklines and contours, with graphic examples of what the breaklines and contours look like.

Deliverables

Except for the Report of Geodetic Control Survey for LiDAR and Photogrammetry, dated March 13, 2008, which was delivered separately and pertains to all deliverables in the Florida Panhandle, the deliverables listed at Table 5 are included on the external hard drive that accompanies this report.

Table 5. Summary of Deliverables

Copies	Deliverable Description	Format	Location
2	Report of Geodetic Control Survey for LiDAR and Photogrammetry, Northwest Florida, dated 3/13/2008	Hardcopy and pdf	Submitted separately
1	Data Dictionary	pdf	Appendix C



3	LiDAR Processing Report	Hardcopy and pdf	Appendix D
3	LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Report	Hardcopy and pdf	Appendix F
1	LiDAR Qualitative Assessment Report	pdf	Appendix G
1	Breakline/Contour Qualitative Assessment Report	pdf	Appendix H
1	Breaklines, Contours, Network-Adjusted Control Points, Vertical accuracy checkpoints, Tiling Footprint, Lidar ground masspoints	Geodatabase	Submitted separately

References

ASPRS, 2007, *Digital Elevation Model Technologies and Applications: The DEM Users Manual*, 2nd edition, American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Bethesda, MD.

ASPRS, 2004, *ASPRS Guidelines, Vertical Accuracy Reporting for Lidar Data*, American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Bethesda, MD, May 24, 2004, http://www.asprs.org/society/committees/lidar/downloads/Vertical_Accuracy_Reporting_for_Lidar_Data.pdf.

Bureau of the Budget, 1947, *National Map Accuracy Standards*, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C.

FDEM, 2006, Florida GIS, *Baseline Specifications for Orthophotography and LiDAR*, Appendix B, *Terrestrial LiDAR Specifications*, Florida Division of Emergency Management, Tallahassee, FL, October, 2006.

FEMA, 2004, Appendix A, *Guidance for Aerial Mapping and Surveying*, to “Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners,” Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C.

FGCC, 1984, *Standards and Specifications for Geodetic Control Networks*, Federal Geodetic Control Committee, Silver Spring, MD, reprinted August 1993.


FGCC, 1988, *Geometric Geodetic Accuracy Standards and Specifications for Using GPS Relative Positioning Techniques*, Federal Geodetic Control Committee, Silver Spring, MD, reprinted with corrections, August, 1989.

FGDC, 1998a, *Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards, Part I: Reporting Methodology*, Federal Geographic Data Committee, c/o USGS, Reston, VA, http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/standards_publications/.

FGDC, 1998b, *Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards, Part 2, Standards for Geodetic Networks*, Federal Geographic Data Committee, c/o USGS, Reston, VA, http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/standards_publications/.

FGDC, 1998b, *Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards, Part 3, National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy*, Federal Geographic Data Committee, c/o USGS, Reston, VA, http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/standards_publications/.

FGDC, 1998d, Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (CSDGM), Federal Geographic Data Committee, c/o USGS, Reston, VA, www.fgdc.gov/metadata/contstan.html.



NDEP, 2004, *Guidelines for Digital Elevation Data*, Version 1.0, National Digital Elevation Program, May 10, 2004, <http://www.ndep.gov/>

NOAA, 1997, *Guidelines for Establishing GPS-Derived Ellipsoid Heights (Standards: 2 cm and 5 cm)*, NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NGS-58, November, 1997.

General Notes

This report is incomplete without the external hard drives of the LiDAR masspoints, breaklines, contours, and control. See the Geodatabase structure at Appendix I.

This digital mapping data complies with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) "Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners," Appendix A: *Guidance for Aerial Mapping and Surveying*.

The LiDAR vertical accuracy report at Appendix F conforms with the National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA).


The digital mapping data is certified to conform to Appendix B, *Terrestrial LiDAR Specifications*, of the "Florida Baseline Specifications for Orthophotography and LiDAR." This report is certified to conform with Chapter 61G17-6, Minimum Technical Standards, of the Florida Administrative Code, as pertains to a Specific Purpose LiDAR Survey.


THIS REPORT IS NOT VALID WITHOUT THE SIGNATURE AND RAISED SEAL OF A FLORIDA PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR AND MAPPER IN RESPONSIBLE CHARGE.

Surveyor and Mapper in Responsible Charge:

David F. Maune, PhD, PSM, PS, GS, CP, CFM
Professional Surveyor and Mapper
License #LS6659


Signed: _____ Date: _____






List of Appendices

- A. County Project Tiling Footprint
- B. County Geodetic Control Points
- C. Data Dictionary
- D. LiDAR Processing Report
- E. QA/QC Checkpoints and Associated Discrepancies
- F. LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Report
- G. LiDAR Qualitative Assessment Report
- H. Breakline/Contour Qualitative Assessment Report
- I. Geodatabase Structure
- J. LAS Header Content Example



Appendix A: County Project Tiling Footprint

1074 Tiles Delivered






List of delivered complete tiles, New LiDAR collect (740):

048731_N	050358_N	057382_N	055220_N	057933_N	055237_N
048732_N	050359_N	057383_N	055221_N	057934_N	055238_N
048733_N	050360_N	057384_N	055222_N	051452_N	050900_N
048734_N	050361_N	057389_N	055223_N	051453_N	050901_N
048735_N	050362_N	054676_N	055224_N	055231_N	050902_N
048736_N	050363_N	054677_N	055225_N	055232_N	050903_N
048737_N	050368_N	054678_N	060108_N	055233_N	050904_N
047116_N	050369_N	054679_N	056311_N	055234_N	050917_N
047117_N	050370_N	054693_N	056312_N	055239_N	050918_N
047656_N	050371_N	060096_N	056313_N	055240_N	050919_N
046577_N	050372_N	060097_N	056314_N	050897_N	050920_N
047657_N	050373_N	060098_N	050364_N	050899_N	057926_N
047653_N	050374_N	060099_N	050365_N	050906_N	057927_N
047654_N	050375_N	060100_N	050366_N	050908_N	057928_N
047655_N	050376_N	060106_N	050367_N	050913_N	057929_N
048193_N	050377_N	060107_N	051442_N	050915_N	060091_N
048194_N	050891_N	054672_N	051443_N	057938_N	060092_N
049811_N	057390_N	054673_N	051444_N	057940_N	060093_N
049812_N	057391_N	054674_N	051445_N	060087_N	060094_N
049813_N	057392_N	054675_N	057385_N	060089_N	051454_N
049814_N	057393_N	054680_N	057386_N	051457_N	051455_N
049815_N	057394_N	054681_N	057387_N	055228_N	051456_N
049816_N	057395_N	054682_N	057388_N	055229_N	051458_N
049817_N	057396_N	054683_N	054671_N	055230_N	051459_N
049271_N	057397_N	054684_N	054685_N	055241_N	051460_N
049272_N	057398_N	054689_N	054686_N	050894_N	051461_N
049273_N	057399_N	054690_N	054687_N	050895_N	051996_N
049274_N	057400_N	054691_N	054688_N	050896_N	051997_N
049275_N	057401_N	054692_N	056301_N	050898_N	051998_N
049276_N	056315_N	054694_N	056302_N	050905_N	051999_N
049277_N	056316_N	054695_N	056303_N	050907_N	052000_N
048195_N	056317_N	054696_N	056304_N	050909_N	052001_N
048196_N	056318_N	056295_N	055212_N	050910_N	053591_N
048197_N	056319_N	056296_N	055213_N	050911_N	053592_N
050893_N	056320_N	056297_N	055226_N	050912_N	053593_N
051431_N	056321_N	056298_N	055227_N	050914_N	053594_N
051432_N	050892_N	056299_N	060101_N	050916_N	053595_N
051433_N	051437_N	056300_N	060102_N	050921_N	053596_N
051434_N	051438_N	056305_N	060103_N	057935_N	053597_N
051435_N	051439_N	056306_N	060104_N	057936_N	055779_N
051436_N	051440_N	056307_N	060105_N	057937_N	052511_N
057379_N	051441_N	056308_N	057920_N	057939_N	052512_N
050378_N	051446_N	056309_N	057921_N	057941_N	052518_N
050351_N	051447_N	056310_N	057922_N	060085_N	052519_N
050352_N	051448_N	055214_N	057923_N	060086_N	052520_N
050353_N	051449_N	055215_N	057924_N	060088_N	052521_N
050354_N	051450_N	055216_N	057925_N	060090_N	052522_N
050355_N	051451_N	055217_N	057930_N	060095_N	052523_N
050356_N	057380_N	055218_N	057931_N	055235_N	052524_N
050357_N	057381_N	055219_N	057932_N	055236_N	052525_N



052526_N	053075_N	055768_N	054159_N	059545_N	060646_N
052527_N	053076_N	055769_N	055780_N	059013_N	060647_N
052528_N	053077_N	055770_N	055781_N	059015_N	060648_N
052529_N	053078_N	055771_N	055764_N	059017_N	061171_N
052534_N	053079_N	055772_N	055765_N	059018_N	061172_N
052535_N	053080_N	055773_N	055766_N	059019_N	061174_N
052536_N	053081_N	055774_N	055767_N	059020_N	061181_N
053054_N	052537_N	055775_N	059544_N	059021_N	061183_N
053055_N	052538_N	055776_N	059546_N	059547_N	061184_N
053060_N	052539_N	055777_N	058462_N	059548_N	061185_N
053061_N	052540_N	055778_N	058463_N	059553_N	061186_N
053062_N	052541_N	051972_N	058464_N	059554_N	061187_N
053063_N	053051_N	051973_N	058465_N	059555_N	061188_N
053064_N	053052_N	051974_N	058466_N	059556_N	061173_N
053069_N	053053_N	051975_N	058467_N	059557_N	061175_N
053070_N	054133_N	051992_N	058472_N	059558_N	061180_N
053601_N	054134_N	051993_N	058473_N	059559_N	061182_N
053602_N	054135_N	051994_N	058474_N	059560_N	062793_N
053603_N	054136_N	051995_N	058475_N	059561_N	062794_N
053604_N	054137_N	052513_N	058476_N	059562_N	062799_N
053605_N	054138_N	052514_N	058477_N	059563_N	062801_N
053606_N	054143_N	052515_N	058478_N	059549_N	062802_N
053607_N	054144_N	052516_N	058479_N	059550_N	062803_N
053608_N	054145_N	052517_N	058480_N	059551_N	062804_N
053609_N	054146_N	052530_N	058481_N	059552_N	062805_N
053610_N	054147_N	052531_N	056842_N	058468_N	062806_N
053611_N	054148_N	052532_N	056843_N	058469_N	062807_N
053612_N	054149_N	052533_N	056844_N	058470_N	062808_N
053617_N	054150_N	053056_N	056845_N	058471_N	063879_N
053618_N	054151_N	053057_N	056846_N	056837_N	063880_N
053619_N	054152_N	053058_N	056847_N	056838_N	063881_N
053620_N	054153_N	053059_N	056848_N	056839_N	063882_N
053621_N	054154_N	053065_N	056849_N	056840_N	063883_N
051971_N	054160_N	053066_N	056851_N	056841_N	063884_N
051976_N	054161_N	053067_N	056853_N	056854_N	063885_N
051977_N	054131_N	053068_N	056858_N	056855_N	063886_N
051978_N	054132_N	053071_N	056860_N	056856_N	063887_N
051979_N	054697_N	053072_N	056850_N	056857_N	063888_N
051980_N	054698_N	053598_N	056852_N	060627_N	064416_N
051981_N	054699_N	053599_N	056859_N	060628_N	064417_N
051982_N	054700_N	053600_N	056861_N	060629_N	060626_N
051983_N	054701_N	053613_N	059003_N	060630_N	060639_N
051984_N	055754_N	053614_N	059004_N	060631_N	060640_N
051985_N	055755_N	053615_N	059005_N	060632_N	060641_N
051986_N	055756_N	053616_N	059006_N	060633_N	061167_N
051987_N	055757_N	054139_N	059007_N	060634_N	061168_N
051988_N	055758_N	054140_N	059008_N	060635_N	061169_N
051989_N	055759_N	054141_N	059009_N	060636_N	061170_N
051990_N	055760_N	054142_N	059010_N	060637_N	060642_N
051991_N	055761_N	054155_N	059011_N	060638_N	061176_N
053073_N	055762_N	054156_N	059012_N	060643_N	061177_N
053074_N	055763_N	054157_N	059014_N	060644_N	061178_N
		054158_N	059016_N	060645_N	061179_N




059564_N	061715_N	064427_N	061721_N	063877_N	067124_N
059565_N	061716_N	064428_N	061722_N	063878_N	067125_N
059566_N	061717_N	063337_N	066042_N	066039_N	067126_N
059567_N	062265_N	063338_N	066043_N	066040_N	067127_N
059568_N	062266_N	063339_N	066044_N	066041_N	067128_N
062251_N	062267_N	063340_N	066045_N	064958_N	065502_N
062252_N	062268_N	063342_N	066046_N	064959_N	065503_N
062253_N	062269_N	063343_N	064957_N	064960_N	065504_N
062254_N	062258_N	063344_N	064962_N	064961_N	065505_N
062255_N	062259_N	063345_N	064963_N	064967_N	066580_N
062256_N	062261_N	063346_N	064964_N	064968_N	066581_N
062257_N	062262_N	063347_N	064965_N	065498_N	066582_N
062263_N	064418_N	063348_N	064966_N	065499_N	066587_N
062264_N	064419_N	066047_N	063336_N	065500_N	066588_N
061709_N	064420_N	066048_N	061723_N	065501_N	066583_N
061710_N	064421_N	061725_N	061724_N	065506_N	066584_N
061711_N	064422_N	061726_N	062795_N	065507_N	066585_N
061712_N	064423_N	061727_N	062796_N	065508_N	066586_N
061713_N	064424_N	061728_N	062797_N	067666_N	068748_N
061714_N	064425_N	061719_N	062798_N	067667_N	068208_N
	064426_N	061720_N	063876_N	067668_N	068207_N

List of complete tiles, Existing LiDAR (334):

048738_N	043903_N	044443_N	047663_N	047666_N	048204_N
046068_N	043904_N	044444_N	047665_N	048748_N	048205_N
048739_N	044982_N	044445_N	047667_N	048749_N	048206_N
048740_N	054164_N	044446_N	047668_N	048750_N	048207_N
048741_N	054165_N	044447_N	047682_N	043362_N	048208_N
042822_N	054166_N	044448_N	047684_N	043363_N	048209_N
042823_N	054167_N	048753_N	048763_N	045525_N	048210_N
042824_N	054168_N	048754_N	048764_N	045526_N	048211_N
042825_N	044983_N	048755_N	048765_N	045527_N	048216_N
042826_N	044984_N	048756_N	048766_N	045528_N	048217_N
042827_N	046066_N	048757_N	048743_N	047669_N	048218_N
042828_N	046067_N	048758_N	048744_N	047670_N	048219_N
042829_N	046062_N	048759_N	048745_N	047671_N	048220_N
043905_N	046064_N	048760_N	048746_N	047672_N	048221_N
043906_N	046063_N	048761_N	048747_N	047685_N	048768_N
043907_N	046065_N	048762_N	048751_N	047686_N	049818_N
043908_N	046603_N	043365_N	048752_N	047687_N	049819_N
044985_N	046604_N	043367_N	045522_N	047688_N	049821_N
044986_N	046605_N	043368_N	045523_N	049827_N	049828_N
044987_N	046606_N	043369_N	045524_N	049829_N	048767_N
044988_N	046602_N	043364_N	047146_N	049832_N	049291_N
047142_N	046607_N	043366_N	047147_N	049833_N	049292_N
047143_N	046608_N	047658_N	047148_N	048200_N	049293_N
047144_N	043909_N	047660_N	047683_N	048201_N	049294_N
047145_N	048742_N	047661_N	047659_N	048202_N	049295_N
043902_N	044442_N	047662_N	047664_N	048203_N	049296_N



049301_N	049845_N	049298_N	050924_N	055784_N	053087_N
049302_N	049846_N	049299_N	051462_N	055785_N	053088_N
049303_N	049847_N	049300_N	051464_N	055786_N	055782_N
049304_N	049848_N	056324_N	055243_N	055787_N	055783_N
049305_N	049278_N	056325_N	055244_N	055788_N	054704_N
049306_N	049279_N	050387_N	055245_N	054708_N	054705_N
049307_N	049284_N	050388_N	055246_N	053622_N	054706_N
049308_N	049285_N	050379_N	055248_N	053623_N	058482_N
048227_N	049286_N	050380_N	050923_N	053624_N	058483_N
048228_N	049287_N	050386_N	050925_N	053625_N	058484_N
049820_N	049288_N	057402_N	050926_N	053626_N	056867_N
049822_N	049289_N	057407_N	050927_N	053627_N	056868_N
049823_N	049290_N	057408_N	050928_N	053628_N	056862_N
049824_N	048198_N	056322_N	057946_N	053082_N	056863_N
049825_N	048199_N	056323_N	051463_N	053083_N	056864_N
049826_N	048212_N	056328_N	051465_N	053084_N	056865_N
048222_N	048213_N	056327_N	051466_N	052542_N	056866_N
048223_N	048214_N	050381_N	051467_N	052543_N	059023_N
048224_N	048215_N	050382_N	051468_N	052544_N	059025_N
048225_N	049831_N	050383_N	057942_N	052545_N	059026_N
048226_N	049834_N	050384_N	057943_N	052546_N	059027_N
049830_N	049835_N	050385_N	057944_N	054162_N	059028_N
049838_N	049836_N	057403_N	057945_N	054163_N	059022_N
049839_N	049837_N	057404_N	052002_N	054702_N	057947_N
049840_N	049280_N	057405_N	052003_N	054703_N	057948_N
049841_N	049281_N	057406_N	052004_N	054707_N	059024_N
049842_N	049282_N	056326_N	052005_N	052547_N	058485_N
049843_N	049283_N	055242_N	052006_N	052548_N	058486_N
049844_N	049297_N	055247_N	052007_N	053085_N	058487_N
		050922_N	052008_N	053086_N	058488_N




Appendix B: County Geodetic Control Points

STATION NAME	County	LATITUDE (Deg, Min, Sec)	LONGITUDE (Deg, Min, Sec)	ELLIPSOID HEIGHT (meters)	NAVD88 HEIGHT (meters)	DESCRIPTION
AA4480	BAY	30 12 19.13162	85 40 30.28049	-22.445	5.298	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# AA4480)
AB2566	BAY	30 15 25.53306	85 29 26.74119	-13.234	14.634	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# AB2566)
AS0327	BAY	29 56 37.59045	85 24 44.12312	-23.182	4.285	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# AS0327)
BE0730	BAY	30 10 34.06121	85 39 33.80459	-18.465	9.285	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# BE0730)
BE1495	BAY	30 13 49.23116	85 54 20.84369	-22.175	5.458	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# BE1495)
BE3026	BAY	30 6 48.21692	85 40 47.74240	-26.579	1.069	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# BE3026)
BE3593	BAY	30 4 35.21772	85 36 31.08605	-19.192	8.438	RECOVERED NSRS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# BE3593)
FB173P17	BAY	30 26 6.58302	85 41 17.04281	1.299	29.209	SET PRIMARY MONUMENT
PNCY	BAY	30 12 16.51768	85 40 41.47891	-17.201	10.57	NSRS CORS STATION (SEE DATASHEET PID# DE6014)



Appendix C: Data Dictionary



LiDARgrammetry Data Dictionary & Stereo Compilation Rules

FDEM (Florida Department of Emergency Management)

January 25, 2008

Table of Contents

Horizontal and Vertical Datum.....	29
Coordinate System and Projection.....	29
Contour Topology Rules	29
Breakline Topology Rules.....	30
Coastal Shoreline	31
Linear Hydrographic Features	33
Closed Water Body Features	35
Road Features	37
Bridge and Overpass Features	38
Soft Features.....	39
Island Features	40
Low Confidence Areas.....	42
Masspoint	43
1 Foot Contours	44
2 Foot Contours	46
Ground Control.....	48
Vertical Accuracy Test Points	49
Footprint (Tile Boundaries)	50
Contact Information	50

Horizontal and Vertical Datum

Horizontal datum shall be referenced to the appropriate Florida State Plane Coordinate System. The horizontal datum shall be North American Datum of 1983/HARN adjustment in US Survey Feet. The vertical datum shall be referenced to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88). Geoid03 shall be used to convert ellipsoidal heights to orthometric heights.

Coordinate System and Projection

All data shall be projected to the appropriate Florida State Plane Coordinate System Zone, Units in US Survey Feet.

Contour Topology Rules

The following contour topology rules have been incorporated into each geodatabase shell provided by PDS. The topology must be validated by each subcontractor prior to delivery to PDS. PDS shall further validate the topology before final submittal to FDEM.

Name: CONTOURS_Topology			Cluster Tolerance: 0.003	
			Maximum Generated Error Count: Undefined	
			State: Analyzed without errors	
Feature Class	Weight	XY Rank	Z Rank	Event Notification
CONTOUR_1FT	5	1	1	No
CONTOUR_2FT	5	1	1	No

Topology Rules

Name	Rule Type	Trigger Event	Origin (FeatureClass::Subtype)	Destination (FeatureClass::Subtype)
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	CONTOUR_1FT::All	CONTOUR_1FT::All
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	CONTOUR_2FT::All	CONTOUR_2FT::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	CONTOUR_2FT::All	CONTOUR_2FT::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	CONTOUR_1FT::All	CONTOUR_1FT::All

Breakline Topology Rules

The following breakline topology rules have been incorporated into each geodatabase shell provided by PDS. The topology must be validated by each subcontractor prior to delivery to PDS. PDS shall further validate the topology before final submittal to FDEM.

Name: BREAKLINES_Topology			Cluster Tolerance: 0.003	
			Maximum Generated Error Count: Undefined	
			State: Analyzed without errors	
Feature Class	Weight	XY Rank	Z Rank	Event Notification
COASTALSHORELINE	5	1	1	No
HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE	5	1	1	No
OVERPASS	5	1	1	No
ROADBREAKLINE	5	1	1	No
SOFTFEATURE	5	1	1	No

Topology Rules

Name	Rule Type	Trigger Event	Origin (FeatureClass::Subtype)	Destination (FeatureClass::Subtype)
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	SOFTFEATURE::All	SOFTFEATURE::All
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	OVERPASS::All	OVERPASS::All
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	ROADBREAKLINE::All	ROADBREAKLINE::All
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All
Must not intersect	The rule is a line-no intersection rule	No	COASTALSHORELINE::All	COASTALSHORELINE::All
Must not overlap	The rule is a line-no overlap line rule	No	SOFTFEATURE::All	ROADBREAKLINE::All
Must not overlap	The rule is a line-no overlap line rule	No	SOFTFEATURE::All	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All
Must not overlap	The rule is a line-no overlap line rule	No	SOFTFEATURE::All	COASTALSHORELINE::All
Must not overlap	The rule is a line-no overlap line rule	No	ROADBREAKLINE::All	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All
Must not overlap	The rule is a line-no overlap line rule	No	ROADBREAKLINE::All	COASTALSHORELINE::All
Must not overlap	The rule is a line-no overlap line rule	No	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All	COASTALSHORELINE::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	SOFTFEATURE::All	SOFTFEATURE::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	OVERPASS::All	OVERPASS::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	ROADBREAKLINE::All	ROADBREAKLINE::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All	HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE::All
Must not self-intersect	The rule is a line-no self intersect rule	No	COASTALSHORELINE::All	COASTALSHORELINE::All

Coastal Shoreline

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: COASTALSHORELINE

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polygon

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polygon feature class will outline the land / water interface at the time of LiDAR acquisition.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
SHAPE_AREA	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Coast	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Coastal Shoreline	The coastal breakline will delineate the land water interface using LiDAR data as reference. In flight line boundary areas with tidal variation the coastal shoreline may require some feathering or edge matching to ensure a smooth transition. Orthophotography will not be use to delineate this shoreline.	<p>The feature shall be extracted at the apparent land/water interface, as determined by the LiDAR intensity data, to the extent of the tile boundaries. For the polygon closure vertices and segments, null values or a value of 0 are acceptable since this is not an actual shoreline. The digital orthophotography is not a suitable source for capturing this feature. Efforts should be taken to gradually feather the difference between tidal conditions of neighboring flights. Stair-stepping of the breakline feature will not be allowed.</p> <p>If it can be reasonably determined where the edge of water most probably falls, beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will be collected at the elevation of the water</p>

			<p>where it can be directly measured. If there is a clearly-indicated headwall or bulkhead adjacent to the dock or pier and it is evident that the waterline is most probably adjacent to the headwall or bulkhead, then the water line will follow the headwall or bulkhead at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is no clear indication of the location of the water's edge beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will follow the outer edge of the dock or pier as it is adjacent to the water, at the measured elevation of the water.</p> <p>Breaklines shall snap and merge seamlessly with linear hydrographic features.</p>
--	--	--	--

Linear Hydrographic Features

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: HYDROGRAPHICFEATURE

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polyline

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polyline feature class will depict linear hydrographic features with a length of 0.5 miles or longer as breaklines.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	HydroL	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Single Line Feature	Linear hydrographic features such as streams, shorelines, canals, swales, embankments, etc. with an average width less than or equal to 8 feet. . In the case of embankments, if the feature forms a natural dual line channel, then capture it consistent with the capture rules. Other embankments fall into the soft breakline feature class	Capture linear hydro features as single breaklines. Average width shall be 8 feet or less to show as single line. Each vertex placed should maintain vertical integrity.
2	Dual Line Feature	Linear hydrographic features such as streams, shorelines, canals, swales, etc. with an average width greater than 8 feet. In the case of embankments, if the feature forms a natural dual line channel, then capture it consistent with the capture rules. Other embankments fall into the soft breakline feature class.	Capture features showing dual line (one on each side of the feature). Average width shall be great than 8 feet to show as a double line. Each vertex placed should maintain vertical integrity and data is not required to show "closed polygon". These instructions are only for docks or piers that follow

			the coastline or water's edge, not for docks or piers that extend perpendicular from the land into the water. If it can be reasonably determined where the edge of water most probably falls, beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will be collected at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is a clearly-indicated headwall or bulkhead adjacent to the dock or pier and it is evident that the waterline is most probably adjacent to the headwall or bulkhead, then the water line will follow the headwall or bulkhead at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is no clear indication of the location of the water's edge beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will follow the outer edge of the dock or pier as it is adjacent to the water, at the measured elevation of the water.
3	Soft Hydro Single Line Feature	Linear hydro features with an average width less than 8 feet that compilation staff originally coded as soft features due to unclear definition of hydro feature, but that have been determined to be hydro features by FDEM. Connectivity and monotonicity are not enforced on these features.	Capture linear hydro features as single breaklines. Average width shall be 8 feet or less to show as single line.
4	Soft Hydro Dual Line Feature	Linear hydro features with an average width greater than 8 feet that compilation staff originally coded as soft features due to unclear definition of hydro feature, but that have been determined to be hydro features by FDEM. Connectivity and monotonicity are not enforced on these features.	Capture features showing dual line (one on each side of the feature). Average width shall be greater than 8 feet to show as a double line. Data is not required to show "closed polygon".

Note: Carry through bridges for all linear hydrographic features.

Closed Water Body Features

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: WATERBODY
Contains Z Values: Yes
Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting
Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polygon
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polygon feature class will depict closed water body features and will have the associated water elevation available as an attribute.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
SHAPE_AREA	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
WATERBODY_ELEVATION_MS	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	HydroP	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Water Body	<p>Land/Water boundaries of constant elevation water bodies such as lakes, reservoirs, ponds, etc. Features shall be defined as closed polygons and contain an elevation value that reflects the best estimate of the water elevation at the time of data capture. Water body features will be captured for features one-half acres in size or greater.</p> <p>“Donuts” will exist where there are islands within a closed water body feature.</p>	<p>Water bodies shall be captured as closed polygons with the water feature to the right. <u>The compiler shall take care to ensure that the z-value remains consistent for all vertices placed on the water body.</u> The field “WATERBODY_ELEVATION_MS” shall be automatically computed from the z-value of the vertices.</p> <p>An Island within a Closed Water Body Feature will also have a “donut polygon” compiled in addition to an Island polygon.</p> <p>These instructions are only for docks or piers that follow</p>

			<p>the coastline or water's edge, not for docks or piers that extend perpendicular from the land into the water. If it can be reasonably determined where the edge of water most probably falls, beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will be collected at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is a clearly-indicated headwall or bulkhead adjacent to the dock or pier and it is evident that the waterline is most probably adjacent to the headwall or bulkhead, then the water line will follow the headwall or bulkhead at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is no clear indication of the location of the water's edge beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will follow the outer edge of the dock or pier as it is adjacent to the water, at the measured elevation of the water.</p>
--	--	--	--

Road Features

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: ROADBREAKLINE

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polyline

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polyline feature class will depict apparent edge or road pavement as breaklines but will not include bridges or overpasses.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Road	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Edge of Pavement	Capture edge of pavement (non-paved or compact surfaces as open to compiler interpretability) on both sides of the road. Runways are not to be included.	DO NOT INCLUDE Bridges or Overpasses within this feature type. Capture apparent edge of pavement (including paved shoulders). Each vertex placed should maintain vertical integrity and data is not required to show "closed polygon". Box culverts should be continued as edge of pavement unless a clear guardrail system is in place; in that case, feature should be shown as bridge / overpass.

Bridge and Overpass Features

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: OVERPASS

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polyline

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polyline feature class will depict bridges and overpasses as separate entities from the edge of pavement feature class.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Bridge	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Bridge Overpass	Feature should show edge of bridge or overpass.	Capture apparent edge of pavement on bridges or overpasses. Do not capture guard rails or non-drivable surfaces such as sidewalks. Capture edge of drivable pavement only. Each vertex placed should maintain vertical integrity and data is not required to show "closed polygon". Box culverts should be captured in this feature class if a clear guardrail system is in place; otherwise, show as edge-of-pavement.

Soft Features

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: SOFTFEATURE
Contains Z Values: Yes
Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting
Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polyline
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polyline feature class will depict soft changes in the terrain to support better hydrological modeling of the LiDAR data and sub-sequent contours.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Soft	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Soft Breakline	<p>Supplemental breaklines where LiDAR mass points are not sufficient to create a hydrologically correct DTM. Soft features shall include ridges, valleys, top of banks, etc.</p> <p>Soft features may also include natural Embankments that act as small ponding areas. Top of Banks can also be included in the soft breakline class so long as it does not define the edge of a water feature.</p>	Capture breaklines to depict soft changes in the elevation. If the elevation changes are easily visible, go light on the breakline capture. Each vertex placed should maintain vertical integrity.

Island Features

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: ISLAND

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polygon

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polygon feature class will depict natural and man-made islands as closed polygons.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
SHAPE_AREA	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Island	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Island	<p>Apparent boundary of natural or man-made island feature captured with a constant elevation.</p> <p>Island features will be captured for features one-half acres in size or greater.</p>	<p>Island shall take precedence over Coastal Shore Line Features. Islands shall be captured as closed polygons with the land feature to the right. The compiler shall take care to ensure that the z-value remains consistent for all vertices placed around the island.</p> <p>These instructions are only for docks or piers that follow the coastline or water's edge, not for docks or piers that extend perpendicular from the land into the water. If it can be reasonably determined where the edge of water most probably falls, beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will be collected at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is a clearly-indicated</p>

			<p>headwall or bulkhead adjacent to the dock or pier and it is evident that the waterline is most probably adjacent to the headwall or bulkhead, then the water line will follow the headwall or bulkhead at the elevation of the water where it can be directly measured. If there is no clear indication of the location of the water's edge beneath the dock or pier, then the edge of water will follow the outer edge of the dock or pier as it is adjacent to the water, at the measured elevation of the water.</p>
--	--	--	--

Low Confidence Areas

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: CONFIDENCE
Contains Z Values: No
Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting
Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polygon
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polygon feature class will depict areas where the ground is obscured by dense vegetation meaning that the resultant contours may not meet the required accuracy specifications.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
SHAPE_AREA	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Obscure	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Low Confidence Area	Apparent boundary of vegetated areas that are considered obscured to the extent that adequate vertical data cannot be clearly determined to accurately define the DTM. These features are for reference only to indicate areas where the vertical data may not meet the data accuracy requirements due to heavy vegetation.	Capture as closed polygon with the obscured area to the right of the line. Compiler does not need to worry about z-values of vertices; feature class will be 2-D only.

Note: Area must be ½ acre or larger. Only outline areas where you are not sure about vegetative penetration of the LiDAR data. This is not the same as a traditional obscured area.

Masspoints

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: MASSPOINT
Contains Z Values: Yes
Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting
Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Point
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This feature class depicts masspoints as determined by the LiDAR ground points (LAS Class 2).

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Masspoint	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Masspoint	Only the bare earth classification (Class 2) shall be loaded into the MASSPOINT feature class.	None. Data should be loaded from LAS Class 2 (Ground)

1 Foot Contours

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: CONTOUR_1FT
Contains Z Values: No
Z Resolution: N/A
Z Tolerance: N/A

Feature Type: Polyline
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polyline feature class will depict 1' contours modeled from the LiDAR ground points and the supplemental breaklines.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
CONTOUR_TYPE_DESC	Long Integer	No		dCONTOURTYPE	0	0	50	Assigned by PDS
CONTOUR_ELEVATION_MS	Double	No			0	0		Calculated by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Intermediate	A contour line drawn between index contours. Depending on the contour interval there are three or four intermediate contours between the index contours.	They are normally continuous throughout a map, but may be dropped or joined with an index contour where the slope is steep and where there is insufficient space to show all of the intermediate lines.
2	Supplementary	Supplementary contours are used to portray important relief features that would otherwise not be shown by the index and intermediate contours (basic contours). They are normally added only in areas of low relief, but they may also be used in rugged terrain to emphasize features. Supplementary contours are shown as screened lines so that they are distinguishable from the basic contours, yet not	These dotted lines are placed in areas where elevation change is minimal. If there is a lot of space between Index and Intermediate Contours (as happens where the land is relatively flat), these lines are added to indicate that there <i>are</i> elevation measurements, even if they are few and far between. If the horizontal distance between two adjacent contours is

		unduly prominent on the published map.	larger than 1" at map scale (100'), then add appropriate supplemental contours from the 1FT_CONTOUR feature class. Supplemental contours do not have to be continuous but should have a minimum length of 200'.
3	Depression	Depression contours are closed contours that surround a basin or sink. They are shown by right-angle ticks placed on the contour lines, pointed inward (down slope). Fill contours are a special type of depression contours, used to indicate an area that has been filled to support a road or railway grade.	Use when appropriate.
4	Index	Index Contours are to be placed at every 5 th contour interval (1, 5, 10, etc...)	No special rules
5	Intermediate Low Confidence	Intermediate contours (Code 1) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.
6	Supplementary Low Confidence	Supplementary contours (Code 2) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.
7	Depression Low Confidence	Depression contours (Code 3) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.
8	Index Low Confidence	Index contours (Code 4) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.

2 Foot Contours

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: CONTOUR_2FT
Contains Z Values: No
Z Resolution: N/A
Z Tolerance: N/A

Feature Type: Polyline
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polyline feature class will depict 1' contours modeled from the LiDAR ground points and the supplemental breaklines.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
CONTOUR_TYPE_DESC	Long Integer	No		dCONTOURTYPE	0	0	50	Assigned by PDS
CONTOUR_ELEVATION_MS	Double	No			0	0		Calculated by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Intermediate	A contour line drawn between index contours. Depending on the contour interval there are three or four intermediate contours between the index contours.	They are normally continuous throughout a map, but may be dropped or joined with an index contour where the slope is steep and where there is insufficient space to show all of the intermediate lines.
2	Supplementary	Supplementary contours are used to portray important relief features that would otherwise not be shown by the index and intermediate contours (basic contours). They are normally added only in areas of low relief, but they may also be used in rugged terrain to emphasize features. Supplementary contours are	These dotted lines are placed in areas where elevation change is minimal. If there is a lot of space between Index and Intermediate Contours (as happens where the land is relatively flat), these lines are added to indicate that there <i>are</i> elevation measurements, even if they are few and far between.

		shown as screened lines so that they are distinguishable from the basic contours, yet not unduly prominent on the published map.	If the horizontal distance between two adjacent contours is larger than 1" at map scale (100'), then add appropriate supplemental contours from the 1FT_CONTOUR feature class. Supplemental contours do not have to be continuous but should have a minimum length of 200'.
3	Depression	Depression contours are closed contours that surround a basin or sink. They are shown by right-angle ticks placed on the contour lines, pointed inward (down slope). Fill contours are a special type of depression contours, used to indicate an area that has been filled to support a road or railway grade.	Use when appropriate.
4	Index	Index Contours are to be placed at every 5 th contour interval (1, 5, 10, etc...)	No special rules
5	Intermediate Low Confidence	Intermediate contours (Code 1) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.
6	Supplementary Low Confidence	Supplementary contours (Code 2) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.
7	Depression Low Confidence	Depression contours (Code 3) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.
8	Index Low Confidence	Index contours (Code 4) that are located in low confidence area should be cut to the low confidence boundary and should be reclassified to this code.	No special collection rules are necessary as this is a geo-processing task.

Ground Control

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: GROUNDCONTROL

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Point

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This feature class depicts the points used in the acquisition and calibration of the LiDAR and aerial photography collected by Aero-Metric, Sanborn and Terrapoint.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
TYPE	Long Integer	No	1	Control	0	0		Assigned by PDS
POINTID	String	Yes					12	Assigned by PDS
X_COORD	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS
Y_COORD	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS
Z_COORD	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Control Point	Primary or Secondary PDS control points used for either base station operations or in the calibration and adjustment of the control.	None.

Vertical Accuracy Test Points

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC

Contains M Values: No

XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting

XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: VERTACCTESTPTS

Contains Z Values: Yes

Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting

Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Point

Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This feature class depicts the points used by PDS to test the vertical accuracy of the data produced.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
POINTID	String	Yes					12	Assigned by PDS
X_COORD	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS
Y_COORD	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS
Z_COORD	Double	Yes			0	0		Assigned by PDS
LANDCOVER	Long Integer	No	1	dLANDCOVERTYPE	0	0		Assigned by PDS

Feature Definition

Code	Description	Definition	Capture Rules
1	Bare-Earth and Low Grass	None.	None.
2	Brush Lands and Low Trees	None.	None.
3	Forested Areas Fully Covered by Trees	None.	None.
4	Urban Areas	None.	None.

Footprint (Tile Boundaries)

Feature Dataset: TOPOGRAPHIC
Contains M Values: No
XY Resolution: Accept Default Setting
XY Tolerance: 0.003

Feature Class: FOOTPRINT
Contains Z Values: No
Z Resolution: Accept Default Setting
Z Tolerance: 0.001

Feature Type: Polygon
Annotation Subclass: None

Description

This polygon feature class includes the Florida 5,000' x 5,000' tiles for each countywide geodatabase produced.

Table Definition

Field Name	Data Type	Allow Null Values	Default Value	Domain	Precision	Scale	Length	Responsibility
OBJECTID	Object ID							Assigned by Software
SHAPE	Geometry							Assigned by Software
DATESTAMP_DT	Date	Yes			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS
SHAPE_LENGTH	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
SHAPE_AREA	Double	Yes			0	0		Calculated by PDS
CELLNUM	String	No			0	0	8	Assigned by PDS

Contact Information

Any questions regarding this document should be addressed to:

Brian Mayfield, C.P., GISP, G.L.S.
Associate / Sr. Project Manager
Dewberry
8401 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, VA 22031
(703) 849-0254 – voice
(703) 340-4141 – cell
bmayfield@dewberry.com

Appendix D: LiDAR Processing Report

Dewberry LiDAR Campaign Final Report for FDEM – Bay County March 2008

Prepared by:

Sanborn

1935 Jamboree Dr., Suite 100

Colorado Springs, CO, 80920

Phone: (719) 593-0093

Fax: (719) 528-5093

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


In the spring of 2007, Sanborn was contracted by Dewberry to execute a LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) survey campaign in the state of Florida. LiDAR data in the form of 3-dimensional positions of a dense set of mass points was collected for the 1025 square miles of Bay County. This data was used in the development of the bare-earth-classified elevation point data sets.

The flight lines used for data acquisition and bore-sighting are shown in the graphic on the next page.

The Leica ALS-50 LiDAR system and the Optech ALTM 2050 LiDAR system was used to collect data for the survey campaign. The LiDAR system is calibrated by conducting flight passes over a known ground surface before and after each LiDAR mission. During final data processing, the calibration parameters are inserted into post-processing software.

The acquired LiDAR data was processed to obtain first and last return point data. The last return data was further filtered to yield a LiDAR surface representing the bare earth.

The contents of this report summarize the methods used to establish the base station coordinate check, perform the LiDAR data collection and post-processing as well as the results of these methods.



Legend

07-12-2007a	07-18-2007a	07-20-2007a	Bay
07-13-2007a	07-18-2007b	07-22-2007a	
07-16-2007a	07-19-2007a	07-23-2007a	
07-16-2007b	07-19-2007b		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	55
1.1	CONTACT INFORMATION	55
1.2	PURPOSE OF THE LiDAR ACQUISITION	55
1.3	PROJECT LOCATION	55
1.4	PROJECT SCOPE, SPECIFICATIONS AND TIME LINE	55
2	LiDAR CALIBRATION	57
2.1	INTRODUCTION	57
2.2	CALIBRATION PROCEDURES	57
2.3	BUILDING CALIBRATION	57
2.4	RUNWAY CALIBRATION, SYSTEM PERFORMANCE VALIDATION	58
3	RUNWAY CALIBRATION, SYSTEM PERFORMANCE VALIDATION	59
3.1	CALIBRATION RESULTS.....	59
3.2	DAILY RUNWAY PERFORMANCE/DATA VALIDATION TESTS	60
3.3	HORIZONTAL VALIDATION	61
4	LiDAR FLIGHT AND SYSTEM REPORT	62
4.1	INTRODUCTION	62
4.2	FIELD WORK PROCEDURES	62
4.3	FINAL LiDAR PROCESSING	63
5	GEODETIC BASE NETWORK.....	65
5.1	NETWORK SCOPE.....	65
5.2	FINAL LiDAR VERIFICATION	65
6	GROUND CONTROL REPORT	67
6.1	INTRODUCTION	67
6.2	HORIZONTAL DATUM	67
6.3	VERTICAL DATUM	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS AND DELIVERABLE COORDINATE AND DATUM SYSTEMS	55
TABLE 2: RUNWAY VALIDATION RESULTS FOR BAY COUNTY (METERS).....	60
TABLE 3: HORIZONTAL VALIDATION RESULTS FOR BAY COUNTY (CENTIMETERS)	61
TABLE 4: COMBINED HORIZONTAL VALIDATION RESULTS FOR BAY COUNTY (CENTIMETERS).....	61
TABLE 5: LiDAR LEICA ACQUISITION PARAMETERS	62
TABLE 6: COLLECTION DATES, TIMES, AVERAGE PER FLIGHT COLLECTION PARAMETERS AND PDOP	63
TABLE 7: PROCESSING ACCURACIES AND REQUIREMENTS	64
TABLE 8: FDEM BAY COUNTY CHECKPOINT RESULTS (US SURVEY FEET).....	66

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: AREA OF COLLECTION	56
FIGURE 2: CALIBRATION PASS 1	58
FIGURE 3: CALIBRATION PASS 2	58
FIGURE 4: RUNWAY CALIBRATION.....	58
FIGURE 5: RUNWAY CALIBRATION RESULTS	60
FIGURE 6: FDEM SURVEY CHECKPOINT DIAGRAM	65

INTRODUCTION

This report contains the technical write-up of the Dewberry LiDAR campaign, including system calibration techniques, the establishment of base stations by a differential GPS network survey, and the collection and post-processing of the LiDAR data.

1.1 Contact Information

Questions regarding the technical aspects of this report should be addressed to:

Sanborn
1935 Jamboree Drive, Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Attention: ----- Andy Lucero (Project Manager)
----- James Young (LiDAR General Manager)
Telephone: ----- 1-719-264-5602
FAX: ----- 1-719-264-5637
email: ----- jyoung@sanborn.com

1.2 Purpose of the LiDAR Acquisition

This LiDAR operation was designed to provide a highly detailed ground surface dataset to be used for the development of topographic, contour mapping and hydraulic modeling

1.3 Project Location

Bay County, Florida

1.4 Project Scope, Specifications and Time Line

The summer of 2007 LiDAR Flight Acquisition required the collection of 1025 square miles of Bay County collected at a nominal point spacing of 0.7 meters and based on the Sanborn FEMA compliant LiDAR product specification.

Table 1: Project Specifications and Deliverable Coordinate and Datum Systems

Area (sq. mi)	1025	Product type	Fema(F)	Projection	Florida State Plane
Vertical Accuracy (CM)	Bare Earth 9.25cm	Check Points required	Yes	Horizontal Datum Vertical Datum	NAD83/Harn NAVD88
Horizontal accuracy (M)	50cm	Number Collected	60	Units	US Survey Ft




Figure 1: Area of Collection
(The area displayed in orange is Bay County)

LiDAR CALIBRATION

2.1 Introduction

LiDAR calibrations are performed to determine and therefore eliminate systematic biases that occur within the hardware of the Leica ALS-50 system. Once the biases are determined they can be modeled out. The systematic biases are corrected for include scale, roll, and pitch.

The following procedures are intended to prevent operational errors in the field and office work, and are designed to detect inconsistencies. The emphasis is not only on the quality control (QC) aspects, but also on the documentation, i.e., on the quality assurance (QA).

2.2 Calibration Procedures

Sanborn performs two types of calibrations on its LiDAR system. The first is a building calibration, and it is done any time the LiDAR system has been moved from one plane to another. New calibration parameters are computed and compared with previous calibration runs. If there is any change, the new values are updated internally or during the LiDAR post-processing. These values are applied to all data collected with the plane/ALS-50 system configurations.

Once final processing calibration parameters are established from the building data, a precisely-surveyed surface is observed with the LiDAR system to check for stability in the system. This is done several times during each mission. An average of the systematic biases are applied on a per mission basis.

2.3 Building Calibration

Whenever the ALS-50 is moved to a new aircraft, a building calibration is performed. The rooftop of a large, flat, rectangular building is surveyed on the ground using conventional survey methods, and used as the LiDAR calibration target. The aircraft flies several specified passes over the building with the ALS-50 system set first in scan mode, then in profile mode, and finally in both scan and profile modes with the scan angle set to zero degrees.

Figure 2 shows a pass over the center of the building. The purpose of this pass is to identify a systematic bias in the scale of the system.

Figure 3 demonstrates a pass along a distinct edge of the building to verify the roll compensation performed by the Inertial Navigation System, INS.

Additionally, a pass is made in profile mode across the middle of the building to compensate for any bias in pitch.




Figure 2: Calibration Pass 1




Figure 3: Calibration Pass 2

2.4 Runway Calibration, System Performance Validation

An active asphalt runway was precisely-surveyed at the Panama City-Bay County International Airport for Bay County using kinematic GPS survey techniques (accuracy: $\pm 3\text{cm}$ at 1σ , along each coordinate axis) to establish an accurate digital terrain model of the runway surface. The LiDAR system is flown at right angles over the runway several times and residuals are generated from the processed data. Figure 4 shows a typical pass over the runway surface.

Approximately 25,000 LiDAR points are observed with each pass. A Triangulated Irregular Network (TIN) surface is created from these passes. The ground control x,y,z points are then compared with the z of the LiDAR surface to compute vertical residuals of the LiDAR data. After careful analysis of noise associated with non-runway returns, any system bias is documented and removed from the process.




Figure 4: Runway Calibration

3 RUNWAY CALIBRATION, SYSTEM PERFORMANCE VALIDATION

3.1 Calibration Results

“Bore-sighting” and “runway calibration” are essentially the same thing, i.e., they determine if the LiDAR sensor has maintained its factory calibration and is still sensing the correct position on the ground, both vertically and horizontally. The LiDAR data captured over the building is used to determine whether there have been any changes to the alignment of the Inertial Measurement Unit, IMU, with respect to the laser system. The parameters are designed to eliminate systematic biases within certain system parameters.

The runway over-flights are intended to be a quality check on the calibration and to identify any system irregularities and the overall noise. IMU misalignments and internal system calibration parameters are verified by comparing the collected LiDAR points with the runway surface.

Figure 5 shows the typical results of a runway over-flight analysis. The X-axis represents the position along the runway. The overall statistics from this analysis provides evidence of the overall random noise in the data (typically, 7 cm standard deviation – an unbiased estimator, and 8 cm RMS which includes any biases) and indicates that the system is performing within specifications. As described in later sections of this report, this analysis will identify any peculiarities within the data along with mirror-angle scale errors (identified as a “smile” or “frown” in the data band) or roll biases.

The calibration is done based on a kinematic survey on the runway. Given that the Kinematic survey RMSE is no better than 4 centimeters as a result of non- exact height of the antenna and weight of the aircraft. Sanborn was required to do additional check points in the project area to meet the 9.25 centimeter vertical accuracy requirement knowing that the calibration site is only good to 4 centimeters RMSE. A z bump adjustment was made to the entire data set based on the survey points in the project area and the relative accuracy of the data to itself and in all areas.




Figure 5: Runway Calibration Results

3.2 Daily Runway Performance/Data Validation Tests

Performance flights over the runway test field were performed before and after each mission. Table 2 shows the standard deviation and RMS values of the residuals between the test flights and the known surface of the test ranges for each pass. The maximum RMS value is 0.122 meters and the maximum standard deviation is 0.119 meters. The average RMS among all test flights is 0.106 meters.

Table 2: Runway Validation Results for Bay County (Meters)

Mission	Passes	Standard Deviation	RMS
193a	4	0.113	0.118
194a	4	0.097	0.107
197a	4	0.089	0.100
197b	4	0.095	0.097
199a	4	0.089	0.089
199b	4	0.092	0.110
200a	4	0.099	0.099
200b	4	0.094	0.095
201a	4	0.112	0.118
203a	4	0.100	0.111
204a	4	0.119	0.122

3.3 Horizontal Validation

Horizontal accuracy was checked within the calibration site and the project area. Five random tiles within each county were selected and five calibrations within each county were selected for the different missions. The horizontal accuracy was checked at both center and edge of the flight line swath in the calibration lines. In the project area the horizontal accuracy was checked in the overlapping areas of these tiles. Locations for each check was randomly selected based on like features in a single flightline overlap or corresponding calibration lines. For example building corner locations were identified and differences were measured in reference to each other. Given that the calibration lines were flown in opposing directions and an additional line was flown perpendicular to these opposing lines, this would indicate a valid horizontal position to the absolute location of the position. If there was an error greater than stated in the specifications, the location directional misalignment would be greater than the specified RMSE in either northing or easting. The difference was checked and the RMSE of all differences were computed and reported in Tables 3 & 4 below. Based on the results of Table 3 & 4 it has been determined that the horizontal accuracy specification has been met. $RMSE_r = \text{SQRT}(RMSE_x^2 + RMSE_y^2) = 27.085 \text{ cm} = 0.8886 \text{ ft}$. Horizontal accuracy at the 95% confidence level = $RMSE_r \times 1.7308 = 1.538 \text{ ft}$, well within the 3.8 ft horizontal accuracy specification.

Table 3: Horizontal Validation Results for Bay County (Centimeters)

Bay County			
Tile	Northing Offset (cm)	Easting Offset (cm)	Center/Edge
56298	8.61	12.62	C
55756	41.69	47.65	C
55755	14.73	21.25	C
54671	25.23	19.26	C
57380	16.93	29.91	E
RMSE	21.438	26.138	
Calibration Mission	Northing Offset (cm)	Easting Offset (cm)	Center/Edge
Day197a	10.07	19.26	E
Day197b	9.11	20.04	E
Day193	7.08	21.09	E
Day201a	12.46	6.17	E
Day203	17.08	19.07	E
RMSE	11.16	17.126	

Table 4: Combined Horizontal Validation Results for Bay County (Centimeters)

Tile/Mission	Northing (cm)	Easting (cm)	Center/Edge
56298	8.61	12.62	C
55756	41.69	47.65	C
55755	14.73	21.25	C
54671	25.23	19.26	C
57380	16.93	29.91	E
Day197a	10.07	19.26	E
Day197b	9.11	20.04	E
Day193	7.08	21.09	E
Day201a	12.46	6.17	E
Day203	17.08	19.07	E
RMSE	16.299	21.632	

4 LiDAR FLIGHT AND SYSTEM REPORT

4.1 Introduction

This section addresses LiDAR system, flight reporting and data acquisition methodology used during the collection of the Bay County campaign. Although Sanborn conducts all LiDAR with the same rigorous and strict procedures and processes, all LiDAR collections are unique.

4.2 Field Work Procedures

A minimum of two GPS base stations were set up, with one receiver located at the airport set up at a new 501 point, and the secondary GPS receivers placed at the survey control points AB2566, BE3593 and BE1495, which are within the project area or within the required baseline specifications of the project.

Pre-flight checks such as cleaning the sensor head glass are performed. A four minute INS initialization is conducted on the ground, with the engines running, prior to flight, to establish fine-alignment of the INS. GPS ambiguities are resolved by flying within ten kilometers of the base stations.

The flight missions were typically four or five hours in duration including runway calibration flights flown at the beginning and the end of each mission. During the data collection, the operator recorded information on log sheets which includes weather conditions, LiDAR operation parameters, and flight line statistics. Near the end of the mission GPS ambiguities are again resolved by flying within ten kilometers of the base stations, to aid in post-processing.

Table 5 shows the planned LiDAR acquisition parameters with a flying height of 800 meters above ground level (AGL) for the Leica system on a mission to mission basis.

Table 5: LiDAR Leica Acquisition Parameters

Average Altitude	800 Meters AGL
Airspeed	~120 Knots
Scan Frequency	36 Hertz
Scan Width Half Angle	20 Degrees
Pulse Rate	50,000 Hertz

Preliminary data processing was performed in the field immediately following the missions for quality control of GPS data and to ensure sufficient overlap between flight lines. Any problematic data could then be re-flown immediately as required. Final data processing was completed in the Colorado Springs office.

Table 6: Collection Dates, Times, Average Per Flight Collection Parameters and PDOP

Mission	Date	Sensor	Start Time	End Time	Altitude (m)	Airspeed (Knots)	Scan Angle	Scan Rate	Pulse Rate	PDOP
193a	Jul 12	Leica	23:03	01:40	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.3
194a	Jul 13	Leica	2:25	6:23	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.2
197a	Jul 16	Leica	2:11	5:45	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.4
197b	Jul 16	Leica	6:46	12:31	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.5
199a	Jul 18	Leica	7:15	12:53	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.3
199b	Jul 18	Leica	23:58	5:03	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.6
200a	Jul 19	Leica	6:28	10:25	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.7
200b	Jul 19	Leica	23:46	4:57	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.3
201a	Jul 20	Leica	06:01	11:01	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.7
203a	Jul 22	Leica	4:29	8:48	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.4
204a	Jul 23	Leica	5:04	10:13	800	120	40°	36	50000	1.2

4.3 Final LiDAR Processing

Final post-processing of LiDAR data involves several steps. The airborne GPS data was post-processed using Waypoint's GravNAV™ software (version 7.5). A fixed-bias carrier phase solution was computed in both the forward and reverse chronological directions. The data was processed for both base stations and combined. In the event that the solution worsened as a result of the combination of both solutions the best of both solutions was used to yield more accurate data. LiDAR acquisition was limited to periods when the PDOP was less than 3.2.

The GPS trajectory was combined with the raw IMU data and post-processed using Applanix Inc.'s POSPROC (version 4.3) Kalman Filtering software. This results in a two-fold improvement in the attitude accuracies over the real-time INS data. The best estimated trajectory (BET) and refined attitude data are then re-introduced into the LEICA ALS post processor for the Leica system to compute the laser point-positions. The trajectory is then combined with the attitude data and laser range measurements to produce the 3-dimensional coordinates of the mass points.

All return values are produced within ALS Post processing software for the Leica system. The multi-return information is processed to obtain the "Bare Earth Dataset" as a deliverable. All LiDAR data is processed using the binary LAS format 1.1 file format.

LiDAR filtering was accomplished using TerraSolid, TerraScan LiDAR processing and modeling software. The filtering process reclassifies all the data into classes with in the LAS formatted file based scheme set using the LAS format 1.1 specifications or by the client. For FDEM the classification specifications are ground, default, noise, water and overlap (Classes: 1, 2, 7, 9 and 12). Once the data is classified, the entire data set is reviewed and manually edited for anomalies that are outside the required guidelines of the product specification or contract guidelines, whichever apply. Table 7 indicates the required product specifications.

The coordinate and datum transformations are then applied to the data set to reflect the required deliverable projection, coordinate and datum systems as provided in the contract.

The client required deliverables are then generated. At this time, a final QC process is undertaken to validate all deliverables for the project. Prior to release of data for delivery, Sanborn's Quality control/ quality assurance department reviews the data and then releases it for delivery.

Table 7: Processing Accuracies and Requirements

Accuracy of LiDAR Data (H)	50 cm RMSE
Accuracy of LiDAR data in bare areas	9.25 cm RMSE
Accuracy of LiDAR data in vegetated areas	18.5 cm RMSE
Percent of artifacts removed (terrain and vegetation dependent)	95%
Percent of all outliers removed	95%
Percent of all vegetation removed	95%
Percent of all buildings removed	98%

5 GEODETIC BASE NETWORK

5.1 Network Scope

During the LiDAR campaign, the geodetic control survey and final coordinates were provided to Sanborn by the PDS team. For Bay County the Sanborn crew set up on NGS points AB2566, BE3593, BE1495 and a 501 point which was set at the airport. These four points were tied into the fully constrained network that was provided.

5.2 Final LiDAR Verification

Figure 6 shows a diagram of the collected checkpoints for Bay County. For the Bay County checkpoint control report the standard deviation is 0.237 feet and the root mean squared is 0.296 feet. The LiDAR data was compared to each of these classes yielding better results than was required for the project. Points indicating removed are points outside the statistical variance in the data. Table 8 indicates the results for Bay County and each point including the overall results as it compares to the LiDAR data set.




Figure 6: FDEM Survey Checkpoint Diagram

Table 8: FDEM Bay County Checkpoint Results (US Survey Feet)

Number	Easting	Northing	Known Z	Laser Z	Dz
<hr/>					
55	1662484.890	391075.930	16.490	16.590	+0.100
49	1570270.880	485436.670	14.950	15.040	+0.090
35	1606699.730	457497.410	7.190	7.280	+0.090
45	1640110.980	460168.130	30.360	30.450	+0.090
37	1498027.600	466839.250	13.800	13.840	+0.040
36	1541455.920	474859.720	11.680	11.620	-0.060
50	1602650.400	487765.650	60.620	60.540	-0.080
48	1524550.370	495018.540	65.300	65.170	-0.130
53	1569998.600	439261.370	4.500	4.350	-0.150
40	1629170.200	412875.240	11.260	10.970	-0.290
34	1596418.210	440131.280	18.690	18.330	-0.360
57	1637346.560	435297.210	48.630	48.270	-0.360
54	1676001.610	346782.630	10.660	10.250	-0.410
38	1598872.480	423617.510	6.880	6.400	-0.480
39	1616816.480	413103.410	22.410	21.890	-0.520
46	1515134.490	512220.830	19.730	19.180	-0.550

Average dz -0.186
 Minimum dz -0.550
 Maximum dz +0.100
 Average magnitude 0.237
 Root mean square 0.296
 Std deviation 0.237

6 GROUND CONTROL REPORT

6.1 Introduction

This section addresses Ground Control reporting in the Ellipsoid model used as part of the collection and the Geoid model used to compute orthometric heights.

6.2 Horizontal Datum

The horizontal datum associated with the LiDAR data is NAD83 (1993)/HARN, as realized by the physical NGS control monuments used to constrain the survey control network.

6.3 Vertical Datum

The vertical datum associated with the LiDAR data is the NAVD88, as realized by the physical NGS benchmarks used to constrain the survey control network.

Appendix E: QA/QC Checkpoints and Associated Discrepancies

Point Number		Land Cover Class	FL SPCS NAD83/99 North Zone		NAVD88		
			Easting-X	Northing-Y	Survey Z	LIDAR-Z	ΔZ
BA001M6	1	BE & Low Grass	1497544.220	466972.260	9.620	9.513	-0.107
BA002M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1497400.630	496936.680	39.480	39.336	-0.144
BA003M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1527539.420	448762.720	23.830	23.686	-0.144
BA004M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1522897.960	484725.680	36.290	36.355	0.065
BA005M8	1	BE & Low Grass	1529990.090	508066.120	56.730	56.802	0.072
BA006M4	1	BE & Low Grass	1507696.210	528115.480	32.110	32.067	-0.043
BA007M7	1	BE & Low Grass	1526467.520	530907.360	22.040	22.063	0.023
BA008M3	1	BE & Low Grass	1546359.970	437813.140	20.750	21.067	0.317
BA009M8	1	BE & Low Grass	1569917.490	420905.670	6.330	6.820	0.490
BA010M7	1	BE & Low Grass	1562583.690	453547.130	4.580	4.307	-0.273
BA010M9	1	BE & Low Grass	1562659.040	453660.880	3.950	3.795	-0.155
BA011M6	1	BE & Low Grass	1538285.480	470873.740	11.500	11.448	-0.052
BA013M3	1	BE & Low Grass	1546190.870	494481.150	49.560	49.709	0.149
BA014M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1572503.610	503992.910	64.380	64.440	0.060
BA015M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1582307.760	416466.730	10.620	10.706	0.086
BA016M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1609463.420	399424.890	20.010	20.481	0.471
BA017M3	1	BE & Low Grass	1586765.100	432168.610	13.900	14.358	0.458
BA018M7	1	BE & Low Grass	1611694.940	424794.180	28.530	28.813	0.283
BA019M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1604696.910	452263.070	12.700	13.075	0.375
BA020M4	1	BE & Low Grass	1587098.710	465772.050	5.780	5.387	-0.393
BA021M7	1	BE & Low Grass	1602279.070	483005.200	47.220	47.469	0.249
BA022M6	1	BE & Low Grass	1586000.880	493727.590	37.190	37.234	0.044
* BA023M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1603608.260	501200.520	79.270	80.091	0.821
BA023M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1603360.870	501189.660	77.980	78.311	0.331
BA024M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1630352.550	384641.700	22.680	22.768	0.088
BA025M3	1	BE & Low Grass	1650965.880	366013.450	18.220	18.482	0.262
BA026M6	1	BE & Low Grass	1634444.710	387444.650	6.930	7.302	0.372
BA028M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1650801.910	415204.930	11.000	11.332	0.332
BA029M8	1	BE & Low Grass	1631629.240	423516.110	32.830	32.906	0.076
BA030M2	1	BE & Low Grass	1642784.600	438328.830	50.970	51.369	0.399
BA031M11	1	BE & Low Grass	1620572.760	444804.270	28.630	29.082	0.452
* BA032M4	1	BE & Low Grass	1649335.910	457494.430	43.670	44.607	0.937
BA033M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1618837.930	467740.290	14.280	14.529	0.249
BA034M1	1	BE & Low Grass	1631505.860	480134.980	21.150	21.774	0.624
BA035M8	1	BE & Low Grass	1641384.320	498786.730	68.680	68.898	0.218
BA036M3	1	BE & Low Grass	1674300.570	348378.360	11.490	11.373	-0.117
BA037M2	1	BE & Low Grass	1687051.410	338035.350	17.300	17.535	0.235
BA039M5	1	BE & Low Grass	1687413.360	376669.700	9.090	8.497	-0.593
BA001M2	2	Brush & Low Trees	1497646.710	467123.220	4.950	5.771	0.821
BA002M3	2	Brush & Low Trees	1497359.670	496942.690	39.790	39.850	0.060
BA003M11	2	Brush & Low Trees	1527531.700	448563.340	23.000	22.284	-0.716
BA004M5	2	Brush & Low Trees	1522820.810	484531.360	35.580	35.618	0.038
BA005M1	2	Brush & Low Trees	1530150.610	508139.290	57.350	57.203	-0.147
BA006M12	2	Brush & Low Trees	1507607.450	528202.190	32.040	31.746	-0.294
BA007M4	2	Brush & Low Trees	1526360.850	530894.590	20.720	20.704	-0.016
BA008M10	2	Brush & Low Trees	1546259.600	437872.000	23.330	23.775	0.445
BA009M10	2	Brush & Low Trees	1569991.420	420882.040	6.680	6.961	0.281
BA010M12	2	Brush & Low Trees	1562712.500	453740.290	3.680	3.479	-0.201
BA011M1	2	Brush & Low Trees	1538205.660	470876.840	11.390	12.126	0.736
BA013M6	2	Brush & Low Trees	1546216.310	494466.090	50.320	50.136	-0.184
BA014M10	2	Brush & Low Trees	1572550.300	504129.570	64.700	64.647	-0.053
BA015M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1582245.270	416561.330	10.060	10.391	0.331
BA016M9	2	Brush & Low Trees	1609430.360	399312.930	19.260	19.694	0.434
BA017M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1586764.450	432202.450	14.110	14.779	0.669
BA019M9	2	Brush & Low Trees	1604616.540	452307.570	11.860	11.945	0.085

BA020M12	2	Brush & Low Trees	1587137.420	465795.580	6.820	6.701	-0.119
BA021M9	2	Brush & Low Trees	1602265.560	482959.650	47.840	48.222	0.382
BA022M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1585934.200	493788.170	35.820	35.902	0.082
BA023M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1603539.730	501239.270	78.150	78.364	0.214
BA024M2	2	Brush & Low Trees	1630466.920	384512.070	22.570	21.934	-0.636
BA025M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1651024.010	366131.850	19.690	19.271	-0.419
BA026M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1634498.330	387414.280	7.150	7.523	0.373
BA028M4	2	Brush & Low Trees	1650712.030	415186.330	10.760	12.262	1.502
BA029M4	2	Brush & Low Trees	1631722.850	423532.570	32.960	33.617	0.657
BA030M7	2	Brush & Low Trees	1642770.520	438372.250	51.560	52.139	0.579
BA032M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1649181.110	457496.060	40.760	41.850	1.090
BA033M2	2	Brush & Low Trees	1618807.290	467656.690	15.110	15.648	0.538
BA034M6	2	Brush & Low Trees	1631496.800	480003.240	20.540	21.337	0.797
BA035M3	2	Brush & Low Trees	1641519.510	498813.860	71.260	71.484	0.224
BA036M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1674259.370	348307.400	10.920	11.052	0.132
BA037M5	2	Brush & Low Trees	1687041.900	338117.570	16.720	16.937	0.217
BA039M8	2	Brush & Low Trees	1687386.560	376670.250	6.000	5.363	-0.637
BA041M7	2	Brush & Low Trees	1685917.510	415293.350	43.600	44.505	0.905
BA041M1	2	Brush & Low Trees	1685937.110	415375.020	43.740	44.419	0.679
BA001M12	3	Forested	1497591.430	466881.870	11.350	11.216	-0.134
BA002M2	3	Forested	1497306.770	496950.850	40.000	39.730	-0.270
BA003M7	3	Forested	1527514.970	448688.260	23.080	22.701	-0.379
BA004M10	3	Forested	1522868.780	484548.130	35.410	35.511	0.101
BA005M11	3	Forested	1530066.590	508008.130	58.540	57.675	-0.865
BA006M11	3	Forested	1507565.520	528164.730	32.380	32.443	0.063
BA007M2	3	Forested	1526302.510	530876.320	20.430	19.826	-0.604
BA008M2	3	Forested	1546419.200	437806.970	21.320	21.191	-0.129
BA009M9	3	Forested	1569959.360	420864.490	6.750	7.615	0.865
BA010M6	3	Forested	1562643.150	453504.580	4.770	4.369	-0.401
BA011M11	3	Forested	1538420.660	470677.460	10.010	10.300	0.290
BA013M8	3	Forested	1546275.810	494516.230	49.510	49.635	0.125
BA014M12	3	Forested	1572443.630	504350.420	62.280	62.507	0.227
BA015M10	3	Forested	1582301.020	416526.710	10.870	11.750	0.880
BA16M10	3	Forested	1609344.880	399308.810	18.830	18.891	0.061
BA017M2	3	Forested	1586723.350	432156.100	13.300	13.367	0.067
BA018M10	3	Forested	1611814.400	424748.650	28.950	28.484	-0.466
BA019M2	3	Forested	1604695.720	452336.040	12.370	12.004	-0.366
BA020M11	3	Forested	1586957.330	465879.180	6.830	6.975	0.145
BA021M12	3	Forested	1602227.460	483059.670	49.480	49.547	0.067
BA022M1	3	Forested	1585994.400	493668.080	38.400	38.280	-0.120
BA023M10	3	Forested	1603381.150	501162.120	78.670	78.407	-0.263
BA024M1	3	Forested	1630360.370	384570.740	23.170	23.329	0.159
BA025M7	3	Forested	1651027.550	366173.320	18.940	19.570	0.630
BA026M10	3	Forested	1634541.440	387394.540	6.970	7.237	0.267
BA028M10	3	Forested	1650735.000	415356.990	15.110	15.036	-0.074
BA029M1	3	Forested	1631783.810	423313.400	34.810	34.864	0.054
BA030M10	3	Forested	1642642.940	438395.080	50.690	51.155	0.465
BA031M8	3	Forested	1620614.440	444767.920	27.770	27.869	0.099
BA032M10	3	Forested	1649199.230	457545.810	42.210	42.737	0.527
BA033M11	3	Forested	1618950.030	467598.270	14.120	15.196	1.076
BA034M11	3	Forested	1631654.210	480099.430	21.590	22.237	0.647
BA035M11	3	Forested	1641311.830	498731.380	67.690	68.001	0.311
BA036M10	3	Forested	1674267.780	348271.100	8.460	8.143	-0.317
BA037M4	3	Forested	1687018.760	338116.770	17.320	18.183	0.863
BA039M10	3	Forested	1687357.150	376649.090	5.800	5.837	0.037
BA041M10	3	Forested	1685830.060	415248.080	43.310	43.781	0.471
BA001M10	4	Urban	1497683.810	466970.720	7.960	7.118	-0.842
BA002M8	4	Urban	1497389.870	496917.420	39.550	39.234	-0.316
BA003M4	4	Urban	1527618.940	448674.380	23.920	23.078	-0.842
BA005M7	4	Urban	1529978.860	508082.360	57.380	56.983	-0.397
BA006M7	4	Urban	1507537.910	528017.280	32.550	31.714	-0.836
BA007M11	4	Urban	1526406.510	531016.850	31.500	30.870	-0.630
BA008M4	4	Urban	1546340.100	437846.530	21.580	21.349	-0.231
BA009M3	4	Urban	1569933.910	420852.720	7.420	7.436	0.016
BA011M7	4	Urban	1538369.170	470820.560	12.290	11.716	-0.574

BA015M1	4	Urban	1582176.070	416601.700	10.970	10.995	0.025
BA016M4	4	Urban	1609458.620	399358.700	20.580	20.627	0.047
BA017M7	4	Urban	1586784.120	432181.300	13.910	14.142	0.232
BA018M3	4	Urban	1611660.700	424807.980	28.880	28.756	-0.124
BA019M3	4	Urban	1604675.340	452278.940	12.630	12.375	-0.255
BA020M6	4	Urban	1587085.620	465863.400	8.910	8.834	-0.076
BA021M5	4	Urban	1602368.100	483034.450	53.280	52.427	-0.853
BA023M4	4	Urban	1603393.660	501206.710	78.910	78.939	0.029
BA024M9	4	Urban	1630438.540	384633.650	24.690	24.106	-0.584
BA025M4	4	Urban	1651007.460	366067.530	18.790	18.534	-0.256
BA026M3	4	Urban	1634467.520	387325.400	8.920	8.958	0.038
BA028M8	4	Urban	1650707.810	415238.540	11.860	11.551	-0.309
BA029M7	4	Urban	1631642.550	423487.670	33.540	33.633	0.093
BA031M6	4	Urban	1620647.320	444733.230	26.850	26.997	0.147
BA032M1	4	Urban	1649232.090	457455.590	42.630	43.336	0.706
BA033M8	4	Urban	1618883.140	467577.750	15.160	14.788	-0.372
BA034M2	4	Urban	1631576.850	480106.940	21.510	21.546	0.036
BA035M5	4	Urban	1641421.180	498770.780	70.260	69.839	-0.421
BA036M4	4	Urban	1674269.050	348364.160	12.340	11.814	-0.526
BA037M8	4	Urban	1687082.870	338236.530	17.900	17.462	-0.438
BA039M2	4	Urban	1687427.680	376647.660	9.330	9.118	-0.212
BA041M4	4	Urban	1685794.960	415388.230	43.870	44.185	0.315

* BA023M1 was not used; as it was determined that new sand/gravel had been put on the road, but not graded, at the time of the LiDAR acquisition. By the time the checkpoint survey was performed, which was one month after the data acquisition, the road had been graded, hence the difference in elevation between the LiDAR bare-earth surface and the field survey at this point location.

* BA032M4 had a delta-z of 0.937 feet and was discarded as an outlier. Outliers are points that exceed 3 times the standard deviation for a given land cover category, which in this case is 0.861 feet. The surveyed checkpoint had a possible discrepancy from using two different heights of instrument (HOI) when measuring backsights from two different GPS points.

100 % of Totals	# of Points	RMSE (ft) Spec = 0.61 (BE = 0.30)	Mean (ft)	Median (ft)	Min (ft)	Max (ft)
Consolidated	140	0.44	-0.07	-0.07	-0.86	1.50
BE & Low Grass	36	0.30	-0.13	-0.12	-0.59	0.67
Brush & Low Trees	36	0.55	-0.25	0.22	-0.72	1.50
Forested	37	0.45	-0.11	-0.07	-0.87	1.08
Urban	31	0.44	-0.24	-0.26	-0.85	0.71

Land Cover Category	# of Points	FVA — Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (RMSEz x 1.9600) Spec = 0.60 ft	CVA — Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (95th Percentile) Spec = 1.19 ft	SVA — Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (95th Percentile) Target = 1.19 ft
Consolidated	140		0.86	
BE & Low Grass	36	0.58		0.52
Brush & Low Trees	36			0.95
Forested	37			0.87
Urban	31			0.84

Appendix F: LiDAR Vertical Accuracy Report

Vertical Accuracy Assessment Report 2007 LiDAR Bare-Earth Dataset for South Bay County, Florida

Date: April 23, 2008

References: A — State of Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM), Contract Number 07-HS-34-14-00-22-469, Task Order Number 20070525-492718a
B — Part 3: *National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA)*, “Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards,” published by the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC), 1998
C — Appendix A, *Guidance for Aerial Mapping and Surveying*, “Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners,” published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), April 2003
D — *Guidelines for Digital Elevation Data*, Version 1.0, published by the National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP), May 10, 2004
E — *ASPRS Guidelines, Vertical Accuracy Reporting for Lidar Data*, published by the American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS), May 24, 2004

Background

FDEM Guidance: Reference A tasked PDS to validate the bare-earth LiDAR dataset of South Bay County, FL, both quantitatively (for accuracy) and qualitatively (for usability). This report addresses the vertical accuracy assessment only, for which FDEM’s major specifications are summarized as follows:

- Vertical accuracy: ≤ 0.30 feet $RMSE_z = \leq 0.60$ feet vertical accuracy at 95% confidence level, tested in flat, non-vegetated terrain only, employing NSSDA procedures in Reference B.
- Validation that the data also satisfies FEMA requirements in Reference C.
- Vertical units (orthometric heights) are in US Survey Feet, NAVD88.

NSSDA Guidance: Section 3.2.2 of Reference B specifies: “A minimum of 20 check points shall be tested, distributed to reflect the geographic area of interest and the distribution of error in the dataset. When 20 points are tested, the 95% confidence level allows one point to fail the threshold given in product specifications.”

FEMA Guidance: Section A.8.6 of Reference C specifies the following LiDAR testing requirement for data to be used by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): “For the NFIP, TINs (and DEMs derived there from) should normally have a maximum RMSE of 18.5 centimeters, equivalent to 2-foot contours, in flat terrain; and a maximum RMSE of 37 centimeters, equivalent to 4-foot contours, in rolling to hilly terrain. The Mapping Partner shall field verify the vertical accuracy of this TIN to ensure that the 18.5- or 37.0-centimeter RMSE requirement is satisfied for all major vegetation categories that predominate within the floodplain being studied ... The assigned Mapping Partner shall separately evaluate and report on the TIN accuracy for the main categories of ground cover in the study area, including the following: [followed by explanations of seven potential categories]... Ground cover Categories 1 through 5 are fairly common everywhere ... The assigned Mapping Partner shall select a minimum of 20 test points for each major vegetation category identified. Therefore, a minimum of 60 test points shall be selected for three (minimum) major land cover categories, 80 test points for four major categories, and so on.”

Note: for this project PDS followed the FDEM guidelines in Reference A, which stipulates that the vertical accuracy report will be based on a minimum of 30 ground measurements for each of four land

cover categories, totaling 120 test points for each 500 square mile area of new topographic data collection. The land cover measurements distributed through each project area will be collected for each of the following land cover categories:

1. Bare-earth and low grass
2. Brush Lands and low trees
3. Forested areas fully covered by trees
4. Urban areas

NDEP and ASPRS Guidance: NDEP guidelines (Reference D) and ASPRS guidelines (Reference E) also recommend a minimum of 60 checkpoints, with up to 100 points preferred. (These guidelines are referenced because FEMA's next update to Appendix A will include these newer NDEP and ASPRS guidelines, now recognizing that vertical errors for LiDAR bare-earth datasets in vegetated terrain do not necessarily follow a normal error distribution as assumed by the NSSDA.)

Vertical Accuracy Test Procedures

Ground Truth Surveys: The PDS team established a primary geodetic network covering approximately 6,000 square miles along the panhandle area of Northwest Florida to provide accurate and consistent control throughout the project area, which includes South Bay County. The Primary Network was used to establish base stations to support airborne GPS data acquisition. Two Secondary control networks were established to support the measurement of checkpoints used in the accuracy validation process for newly generated LiDAR and Orthophotography.

Assessment Procedures and Results: The LiDAR accuracy assessment for South Bay County was performed in accordance with References D and E which assume that LiDAR errors in some land cover categories may not follow a normal error distribution. This assessment was also performed in accordance with References B and C which assume that LiDAR bare-earth datasets errors do follow a normal error distribution. Comparisons between the two methods help determine the degree to which *systematic errors* may exist in South Bay County's four major land cover categories: (1) bare-earth and low grass, (2) brush lands and low trees, (3) forested areas fully covered by trees, (4) urban areas. When a LiDAR bare-earth dataset passes testing by both methods, compared with criteria specified in Reference A, the dataset clearly passes all vertical accuracy testing criteria for a digital terrain model (DTM) suitable for FDEM and FEMA requirements.

The relevant testing criteria, as stipulated in Reference A are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 — DTM Acceptance Criteria for South Bay County

Quantitative Criteria	Measure of Acceptability
Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) in open terrain only = 95% confidence level	0.60 ft (0.30 ft RMSE _z x 1.96000) for open terrain only
Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) in individual land cover categories = 95% confidence level	1.19 ft (based on 95 th percentile per land cover category)
Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) in all land cover categories combined = 95% confidence lever	1.19 ft (based on combined 95 th percentile)

Vertical Accuracy Testing in Accordance with NDEP and ASPRS Procedures

References D and E specify the mandatory determination of Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) and the optional determination of Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) and Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA). FVA determines how well the LiDAR sensor performed in category (1), open terrain, where errors are random and normally distributed; whereas SVA determines how well the vegetation classification algorithms worked in land cover categories (2) and (3) where LiDAR elevations are often higher than surveyed elevations and category (4) where LiDAR elevations are often lower.

FVA is determined with check points located only in land cover category (1), open terrain (grass, dirt, sand, and/or rocks), where there is a very high probability that the LiDAR sensor will have detected the bare-earth ground surface and where random errors are expected to follow a normal error distribution. The FVA determines how well the calibrated LiDAR sensor performed. With a normal error distribution, the vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level is computed as the vertical root mean square error ($RMSE_z$) of the checkpoints $\times 1.9600$, as specified in Reference B. For South Bay County, for which floodplains are essentially flat, FDEM required the FVA to be 0.60 ft (18.29 cm) at the 95% confidence level (based on an $RMSE_z$ of 0.30 ft (9.14 cm), equivalent to 1 ft contours).

CVA is determined with all checkpoints in all land cover categories combined where there is a possibility that the LiDAR sensor and post-processing may yield elevation errors that do not follow a normal error distribution. CVA at the 95% confidence level equals the 95th percentile error for all checkpoints in all land cover categories combined. FDEM's CVA standard is 1.19 ft at the 95% confidence level. The CVA is accompanied by a listing of the 5% outliers that are larger than the 95th percentile used to compute the CVA; these are always the largest outliers that may depart from a normal error distribution. Here, $Accuracy_z$ differs from CVA because $Accuracy_z$ assumes elevation errors follow a normal error distribution where RMSE procedures are valid, whereas CVA assumes LiDAR errors may not follow a normal error distribution in vegetated categories, making the RMSE process invalid.

SVA is determined separately for each individual land cover category, again recognizing that the LiDAR sensor and post-processing may yield elevation errors that do not follow a normal error distribution, and where discrepancies can be used to identify the nature of systematic errors by land cover category. For each land cover category, the SVA at the 95% confidence level equals the 95th percentile error for all checkpoints in each individual land cover category. SVA statistics are calculated individually for bare-earth and low grass, brush lands and low trees, forested areas, and urban areas, in order to facilitate the analysis of the data based on each of these land cover categories that exist within South Bay County. The SVA criteria in Table 1 (1.19 ft at the 95% confidence level for each category) are target values only and are not mandatory; it is common for some SVA criteria to fail individual target values, yet satisfy FEMA's mandatory CVA criterion.

QA/QC Steps: The primary QA/QC steps used by PDS were as follows:

1. PDS surveyed "ground truth" QA/QC vertical checkpoints in accordance with guidance in references B, C, D and E. Figure 1 shows the location of "cluster areas" where PDS attempted to survey a minimum of 30 QA/QC checkpoints in each of the four land cover categories. Some cluster areas did not include all land cover categories. The final totals were 36 checkpoints in bare-earth and low grass; 36 checkpoints in brush and low trees; 37 checkpoints in forested areas; and 31 checkpoints in urban areas, for a total of 140 checkpoints.
2. Next, PDS interpolated the bare-earth LiDAR DTM to provide the z-value for each of the 144 checkpoints.
3. PDS then computed the associated z-value differences between the interpolated z-value from the LiDAR data and the ground truth survey checkpoints and computed the FVA, CVA and SVA values using procedures in References D and E.

4. The data were analyzed by PDS to assess the accuracy of the data. The review process examined the various accuracy parameters as defined by FDEM guidelines. Also, the overall descriptive statistics of each dataset were computed to assess any trends or anomalies. The following tables, graphs and figures illustrate the data quality.

Figure 1 shows the location of the QA/QC checkpoint clusters within South Bay County. Each point represents a checkpoint cluster and each cluster includes checkpoints in different land cover categories. There are nominally four checkpoints in each cluster, one per land cover category.

Figure 1 — Location of QA/QC Checkpoint Clusters for South Bay County




Table 2 summarizes the vertical accuracy by fundamental, consolidated and supplemental methods:

Table 2 — FVA, CVA and SVA Vertical Accuracy at 95% Confidence Level

Land Cover Category	# of Points	FVA — Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (RMSE_z x 1.9600) Spec = 0.60 ft	CVA — Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (95th Percentile) Spec = 1.19 ft	SVA — Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (95th Percentile) Target = 1.19 ft
Total Combined	140		0.86	
BE & Low Grass	36	0.58		0.52
Brush & Low Trees	36			0.95
Forested	37			0.86
Urban	31			0.84

Fundamental and Consolidated Vertical Accuracy at 95% confidence level, using NDEP/ASPRS methodology:

The RMSE_z in bare-earth and low grass was within the target criteria of 0.30 ft, and the FVA tested 0.58 ft at the 95% confidence level in open terrain, based on RMSE_z x 1.9600.

Compared with the 1.19 ft specification, CVA tested 0.73 ft at the 95% confidence level in bare-earth and low grass, brush and low trees, forested, and urban areas combined, based on the 95th Percentile. Table 3 lists the 5% outliers larger than the 95th percentile error; whereas 5% of the points could have exceeded the 1.19 ft criterion, one point exceeded this criterion, near a low confidence area..

Table 3 — 5% Outliers Larger than 95th Percentile

Errors Exceeding 95th Percentile		
Land Cover Category	Elevation Difference (feet)	Explanation
Brush & Low Trees	1.502	Checkpoint BA28M4 near low confidence area

Compared with the 1.19 ft SVA target values, SVA tested 0.52 ft at the 95% confidence level in bare-earth and low grass; 0.95 ft in brush and low trees; 0.87 ft in forested areas; and 0.84 ft in urban areas, based on the 95th Percentile. Each of the four land cover categories were well within the target value of 1.19 ft.

Figure 2 illustrates the SVA by specific land cover category.




Figure 2 — Graph of SVA Values by Land Cover

Figure 3 illustrates the magnitude of the differences between the QA/QC checkpoints and LiDAR data by specific land cover category and sorted from lowest to highest. This shows a normal distribution of points in all categories. One category 2 checkpoint in the brush and low grass exceed the 1.19 ft SVA accuracy criteria by 0.31 ft.




Figure 3 – Magnitude of Elevation Discrepancies, Sorted from Largest Negative to Largest Positive

The NSSDA and FEMA guidelines were both published before it was recognized that LiDAR errors do not always follow a normal error distribution. Future changes to these FGDC and FEMA documents are expected to follow the lead of the NDEP and ASPRS. Nevertheless, to comply with FEMA's current guidelines in Reference C, RMSE_z statistics were computed in all four land cover categories, individually and combined, as well as other statistics that FEMA recommends to help identify any unusual characteristics in the LiDAR data. These statistics are summarized in Figures 4 and 5 and Table 4 below, consistent with Section A.8.6.3 of Reference C.




Figure 4 — RMSE_z statistics by Land Cover Category

Table 4 — Overall Descriptive Statistics by Land Cover Category and Consolidated

Descriptive Statistics							
Land Cover Category	Points	RMSE (feet)	Mean Error (feet)	Median Error (feet)	Skew	St Dev (feet)	95th Percentile (feet)
Consolidated	140	0.440	0.070	0.070	0.180	0.440	0.860
BE & Low Grass	36	0.295	0.132	0.119	-0.556	0.268	0.516
Brush & Low Trees	36	0.548	0.246	0.220	0.146	0.497	0.951
Forested	37	0.448	0.111	0.067	0.207	0.440	0.868
Urban	31	0.439	-0.239	-0.255	0.184	0.375	0.842

Fundamental and Consolidated Vertical Accuracy at 95% confidence level, using NSSDA/FEMA methodology:

Although the NSSDA and FEMA guidelines predated FVA and CVA terminology, vertical accuracy at the 95% confidence level (called Accuracy_z) is computed by the formula $\text{RMSE}_z \times 1.9600$. Accuracy_z in open terrain = $0.30 \text{ ft} \times 1.9600 = 0.58 \text{ ft}$, satisfying the 0.60 ft FVA standard. Accuracy_z in consolidated categories = $0.44 \text{ ft} \times 1.9600 = 0.87 \text{ ft}$, satisfying the 1.19 ft CVA standard.

Figure 5 illustrates a histogram of the associated elevation discrepancies between the QA/QC checkpoints and elevations interpolated from the LiDAR triangulated irregular network (TIN). The frequency shows the number of discrepancies within each band of elevation differences. Although the discrepancies vary between a low of -0.86 ft and a high of +1.50 ft, the histogram shows that slightly more of the discrepancies are skewed on the positive side of what would be a “bell curve,” with mean of zero, if the data were truly normally distributed. Typically the discrepancies tend to skew a bit more to the positive side, because discrepancies in vegetation are typically positive.




Figure 5 — Histogram of Elevation Discrepancies within 0.02 ft Bands

Reclassified Checkpoints

Checkpoint BA041M1 did not fit the specified criteria for Category 1, bare-earth and low grass and was reclassified as Category 2, brush and low trees, because the grass was longer than 6” tall, the norm for low grass. The digital pictures taken in the field, which show each checkpoint location, are an invaluable tool in the proper analysis of discrepancies that may occur between the LiDAR terrain surface elevations and the field surveyed checkpoint elevations.

Figure 6 shows the digital pictures captured in the field for Category 1 checkpoint BA041M1. This point location actually fit the criteria for Category 2 checkpoints, brush and low trees, as the height of the grass exceeds 6 inches – the norm for Category 1. This point was reclassified to Category 2 for the final vertical accuracy calculations.



Figure 6 — Field Picture for Checkpoint BA041M1

Figure 7 shows the field picture for Category 1 checkpoint BA023M1. It is clear from this picture that the sand/gravel road is level in this area.



Figure 7 — Field Picture for Checkpoint BA023M1

Figure 8 shows a colorized TIN of the bare-earth surface and the location of checkpoint BA023M1. The sand/gravel comes in from the east and meets up with the asphalt road intersection.




Figure 9 shows a screen shot of a splits-screen profile taken along the centerline of a portion of the asphalt road. The blue arrow shows the location of BA023M1 on the profile line. This point is 0.821' higher than the checkpoint elevation of 79.27'. The Lidar was acquired on 7/9/07 and the survey was 8/6/07, evidence that new sand/gravel may been put on this portion of the road just prior to the Lidar acquisition and subsequently graded level prior to the checkpoint survey. This point was not used in the vertical accuracy assessment.





Figure 9 – Split-screen profile showing the location of BA023M1 on the profile line

Conclusions

Based on the vertical accuracy testing conducted by PDS, the undersigned certifies that the LiDAR dataset for South Bay County, Florida satisfies the criteria established by Reference A:

- Based on NSSDA, FEMA, NDEP and ASPRS methodology: Tested 0.58' vertical accuracy at 95% confidence level in open terrain.
- Based on NSSDA, FEMA, NDEP and ASPRS methodology: Tested 0.86' vertical accuracy at 95% confidence level in all land cover categories combined.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David F. Maune". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "David" and last name "Maune" clearly legible.

David F. Maune, Ph.D., PSM, PS, GS, CP
QA/QC Manager

Appendix G: LiDAR Qualitative Assessment Report

References:

- A — State of Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM), Contract Number 07-HS-34-14-00-22-469, Task Order Number 20070525-492718a
- B — Part 3: *National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA)*, “Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards,” published by the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC), 1998
- C — Appendix A, *Guidance for Aerial Mapping and Surveying*, “Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners,” published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), April 2003
- D — *Guidelines for Digital Elevation Data*, Version 1.0, published by the National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP), May 10, 2004
- E — *ASPRS Guidelines, Vertical Accuracy Reporting for LiDAR Data*, published by the American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS), May 24, 2004

Qualitative Assessment

The PDS qualitative assessment utilizes a combination of statistical analysis and interpretative methodology to assess the quality of the data for a bare-earth digital terrain model (DTM). This process looks for anomalies in the data and also identifies areas where man-made structures or vegetation points may not have been classified properly to produce a bare-earth model. Overall the data are of good quality and should satisfy most users for an accurate bare-earth elevation data product.

Overview

Within this review of the LiDAR data, two fundamental questions were addressed:

- Did the LiDAR system perform to specifications?
- Did the vegetation removal process yield desirable results for the intended bare-earth terrain product?

Mapping standards today address the quality of data by quantitative methods. If the data are tested and found to be within the desired accuracy standard, then the data set is typically accepted. Now with the proliferation of LiDAR, new issues arise due to the vast amount of data. Unlike photogrammetrically-derived DEMs where point spacing can be eight meters or more, the nominal LiDAR point spacing for this project was 0.7 meters, and with the PDS team’s 50% sidelap between flightlines, the nominal overall point density was designed to be approximately 4 points per square meter. The end result is that millions of elevation points are measured to a level of accuracy previously unseen for traditional, elevation mapping technologies, and vegetated areas are measured that would be nearly impossible to survey by other means. The downside is that with millions of points, the data set is statistically bound to have some errors both in the measurement process and in the artifact removal process.

As previously stated, the quantitative analysis addresses the quality of the data based on absolute accuracy. This accuracy is directly tied to the comparison of the discreet measurement of the survey checkpoints and that of the interpolated value within the three closest LiDAR points that constitute the vertices of a three-dimensional triangular face of the TIN. Therefore, the end result is that only a small sample of the LiDAR data is actually tested. However there is an increased level of confidence with LiDAR data due to the relative accuracy. This relative accuracy in turn is based on how well one LiDAR

point "fits" in comparison to the next contiguous LiDAR measurement. Once the absolute and relative accuracy has been ascertained, the next stage is to address the cleanliness of the data for a bare-earth DTM.

By using survey checkpoints to compare the data, the absolute accuracy is verified, but this also allows us to understand if the artifact removal process was performed correctly. To reiterate the quantitative approach, if the LiDAR sensor operated correctly over open terrain areas, then it most likely operated correctly over the vegetated areas. This does not mean that the bare-earth was measured, but that the elevations surveyed are most likely accurate (including elevations of treetops, rooftops, etc.). In the event that the LiDAR pulse filtered through the vegetation and was able to measure the true surface (as well as measurements on the surrounding vegetation) then the level of accuracy of the vegetation removal process can be tested as a by-product.

To fully address the data for overall accuracy and quality, the level of cleanliness (or removal of above-ground artifacts) is paramount. Since there are currently no effective automated testing procedures to measure cleanliness, PDS employs a combination of statistical and visualization processes. This includes creating pseudo image products such as LiDAR orthos produced from the intensity returns, Triangular Irregular Network (TIN)'s, Digital Elevation Models (DEM) and 3-dimensional models. By creating multiple images and using overlay techniques, not only can potential errors be found, but the PDS team can also find where the data meets and exceeds expectations. This report will present representative examples where the LiDAR and post processing had issues as well as examples of where the LiDAR performed well.

Analysis

Process

PDS utilizes GeoCue software products as the primary geospatial process management system. GeoCue is a three tier, multi-user architecture that uses .NET technology from Microsoft. .NET technology provides the real-time notification system that updates users with real-time project status, regardless of who makes changes to project entities. GeoCue uses database technology for sorting project metadata. PDS uses Microsoft SQL Server as the database of choice.

The PDS qualitative assessment process flow for Bay County, FL incorporated the following reviews:

1. *Statistical Analysis*- A statistical analysis routine was run on the .LAS files upon receipt to verify that the .LAS files met project specifications. This routine checked for the presence of Variable Length Records, verified .LAS classifications, verified header records for min/max x,y,z, and parsed the .LAS point file to confirm that the min/max x,y,z matched the header records. These statistics were run on the all-return point data set as well as the bare-earth point data set for every deliverable tile.
 - a. All LAS files contained Variable Length Records with georeferencing information.
 - b. All LiDAR points in the LAS files were classified in accordance with project specifications: Class 1 - Unclassified, Class 2 - Ground, Class 7 - Noise, and Class 9 - Water. **No records were present in Class 12 - Overlap as Sanborn utilized all points in the overlap areas in the terrain files.**
 - c. Min/max x,y,z values matched the header files.
2. *Spatial Reference Checks*- The .LAS files were imported into the GeoCue processing environment. As part of the URS process workflow the GeoCue import produced a minimum bounding polygon for each data file. This minimum bounding polygon was one of the tools used in conjunction with the statistical analysis to verify spatial reference integrity. No issues were identified with the spatial referencing of this dataset.
3. *Data Void/ Gap Checks*-The imported .LAS files were used to create LiDAR “orthos”. The LiDAR orthos were one of the tools used to verify data coverage and point density, to check for data voids or gaps, and to use as reference data during checks for data anomalies and artifacts. This product is not intended to be a project deliverable. The orthos were derived from the Full Point Cloud elevations and LiDAR pulse return intensity values. The intensity values were used as delivered with no normalization applied. Due to the point density of the Florida Baseline Specifications, the orthos were produced at 1 foot pixel resolution for the entire area of interest (see Figure 1).




Figure 9 Screenshot of Coastal Bay County LiDAR Orthos produced from Intensity Returns

Coastal Bay County contained data voids (areas with no LiDAR returns in the LAS files). These voids are present in the majority of LiDAR projects due to large bodies of water. These are considered to be acceptable voids (Figure 2).




Figure 10 Acceptable voids in data due to water bodies

4. *Initial Data Verification:* PDS performs an initial 10% random check of the data delivery by looking at each tile individually in great detail utilizing TIN surfaces and profiles. If the data set passes the 10 % check, the tiles continue through the remaining QC work flow where every tile is reviewed. If the data set fails the 10% check it is normally due to a systematic process error and the data set is sent back to the vendor for correction. Upon receipt of the corrected tile/s the check is performed again to ensure that any flagged errors were corrected and additional issues were not inadvertently introduced during the corrective action.
5. *Data Density/Elevation checks:* The .LAS files are used to produce Digital Elevation Models using the commercial software package “QT Modeler” which creates a 3-dimensional data model derived from Class 2 (ground points) in the .LAS files. Grid spacing is based on the project density deliverable requirement for un-obscured areas. For the FDEM project it is stipulated that the maximum post spacing in un-obscured areas should not exceed 1.2m.

Model statistics were produced and characterized by density, scale, intensity, and elevation. (Figure 5) The low confidence area polygons were overlaid onto the density grids to ensure that all low confidence areas were properly identified with a polygon. As with the LiDAR orthos, this product was produced for Quality Assessment purposes only.




Figure 11 LID059011 and LID059012: Density grid of Bay County, created using a green to red color ramp. Green areas meet project specifications; red delineates areas not meeting minimum density requirements (primarily water, buildings and low-confidence areas)

6. *Artifact Anomaly Checks.* The final step in the analysis was to review every tile for anomalies that may exist in the bare-earth terrain surface. Items that were checked include, but are not limited to: buildings, bridges, vegetation and water points classified as Class 2 points and elevation “steps” that may occur in the overlap between adjacent flight lines. Any issues found are addressed in the below “General comments and issues”.

General comments and issues

The project area in Bay County, Florida is predominantly coastal with large internal water bodies. There is a large urban area, Panama City, and also Tyndall Air Force Base (highlighted in red in the figure below). There is one State Forest, Pinelog. There are several Small State Parks. It has significant marsh areas. (Figure 4).




Figure 4 Map of Bay County Florida with Marsh areas from Florida Geographic Data Library (FGDL) areas designated with red tiles were acquired by the Sanborn Map Company in a previous flight acquisition then the FDEM Bay County Lidar acquisition project.

The initial data acquisition was very dense. Overall the calculated average maximum point density of all the Bay County LAS files was .48m. In general, the bare earth ground surface was clear of artifacts and very clean. The algorithms used to classify the above-ground ground points were very stringent; given the overall physical characteristics of the county this does not seem

inappropriate. There is a fine line in the decision-making process of which points to classify as ground. By removing points from the ground classification due to heavy vegetation there is risk of over-smoothing or “flattening” the ground surface which can have a greater impact than leaving points to maintain the ground surface model. In addition, due to the lack of significant elevation changes in the physical terrain there are places where there is no visible break in the terrain between the ground surface and what in traditional mapping would be considered a hard breakline feature, for example roads.

Because the project includes the collection of breaklines, this will be compensated for in the hard breakline collection. The LiDAR data contained sporadic issues such as artifacts or small anomalies which is typical of any LiDAR dataset. Due to the presence of dense vegetation throughout the county, the low confidence area polygons and breaklines are important deliverables for this particular county.

Bay County

The bare earth terrain model was checked for consistency in bare earth processing, tile edge-match with neighboring tiles, flight line edge match, correct water classification and bridge, building and vegetation removal. There was initially a vertical accuracy failure which was corrected by the Contractor. There were also failures in the water classification routines used by the contractor. These were also corrected. There were some issues noted in the qualitative assessment but these were minor and repaired by the contractor. Of the 755 LAS files reviewed, some tiles were flagged for containing noise points or artifacts, visible seamlines between adjacent flight lines, gaps on open road surfaces, removal of culverts, and for the improper classification of points in water bodies to the ground classification. The redelivery of the data was checked thoroughly and passed. The following table and associated screenshots is representative of the issues found:

Tile	Issue	Code
49299	Spikes - Artifacts	Corrected
49300	Spikes - Artifacts	Corrected
49818	High Points in Low Confidence Areas	Corrected/Reclassified
46066	High Points in Low Confidence Areas	Corrected/Reclassified
46068	Flightline-step	Noted: Existing Data
46069	Flightline-step	Noted: Existing Data
54152	Lack of points on open road surface	Noted
47655	Docks & Piers left as ground points	Corrected
46604	Irregular Terrain surrounding open field	Noted

Figure 12 Tile 049299 – artifacts in ground points.





Figure 13 Tile 049300 _artifacts in ground points.

Figure 7 Tile 049818 – High points in low confidence area.





Figure 8 Tile 046066 – High Points in Low Confidence area




Figure 9 Tile 46068 – Flightline step




Figure 10 Tile 46069 – Flightline step





Figure 11 Tile 54152 – Lack of points on open road surface





Figure 12 Tile 47655 – Docks and Piers left as ground points





Figure 13 Tile 046604 – Irregular Terrain surrounding open field

Conclusion


Overall the data meets the project specifications. The classification of the raw point cloud to bare ground was executed well given the low terrain relief and areas of dense vegetation. The data did contain areas of improperly classified water points, and removed culverts; however these issues were corrected by The Sanborn Map Company and were not present in the redelivered data. There were areas noted as containing visible seamlines from flight line to flight line in the existing data.



Appendix H: Breakline/Contour Qualitative Assessment Report

Coastal Shorelines

Coastal shorelines are correctly captured as two-dimensional polygon features, extracted from the LiDAR data and not from digital orthophotos, except for manmade features with varying heights such as seawalls which are captured as three-dimensional breaklines. Coastal breaklines merge seamlessly with linear hydrographic features. Shorelines continue beneath docks and piers. There is no “stair-stepping” of coastal shorelines. Figure 1 shows example coastal breaklines and contours.



Contours

- DEPRESSION
- +— DEPRESSION LOW CONFIDENCE
- INDEX
- +— INDEX LOW CONFIDENCE
- INTERMEDIATE
- +— INTERMEDIATE LOW CONFIDENCE
- SUPPLEMENTARY
- +— SUPPLEMENTARY LOW CONFIDENCE

Breaklines

- Dual Line Feature
- Single Line Feature
- Soft Hydro Dual Line Feature
- Soft Hydro Single Line Feature
- OVERPASS
- ROADBREAKLINE
- SOFTFEATURE
- ISLAND
- WATERBODY
- COASTALSHORELINE
- LOWCONFIDENCE

Figure 1. Example coastal breaklines and contours from tile #57921

Linear Hydrographic Features

Linear hydrographic features are correctly captured as three-dimensional breaklines – single line features if the average width is 8 feet or less and dual line features if the average width is greater than 8 feet. Each vertex maintains vertical integrity. Figure 2 shows example breaklines and contours of linear hydrographic features.



Contours

- DEPRESSION
- +— DEPRESSION LOW CONFIDENCE
- INDEX
- +— INDEX LOW CONFIDENCE
- INTERMEDIATE
- +— INTERMEDIATE LOW CONFIDENCE
- SUPPLEMENTARY
- +— SUPPLEMENTARY LOW CONFIDENCE

Breaklines

- Dual Line Feature
- Single Line Feature
- Soft Hydro Dual Line Feature
- Soft Hydro Single Line Feature
- OVERPASS
- ROADBREAKLINE
- SOFTFEATURE
- ISLAND
- WATERBODY
- COASTALSHORELINE
- LOWCONFIDENCE

Figure 2. Example linear hydrographic feature breaklines and contours from tile # 59006

Closed Water Body Features

Closed water body features with an area of one-half acre or greater are correctly captured as two-dimensional closed polygons with a constant elevation that reflects the best estimate of the water elevation at the time of data capture. “Donuts” exist where there are islands within a closed water body feature. Figure 3 shows example breaklines and contours of closed water body features.




Figure 3. Example closed water body feature breaklines and contours from tile #48752

Road Features

Road edge of pavement features are correctly captured as three-dimensional breaklines on both sides of paved roads. Box culverts are continued as edge of pavement unless a clear guardrail system is in place; in that case, culverts are captured as a bridge or overpass feature. Each vertex maintains vertical integrity. Figure 4 shows example breaklines and contours of road features.



Contours

- DEPRESSION
- DEPRESSION LOW CONFIDENCE
- INDEX
- INDEX LOW CONFIDENCE
- INTERMEDIATE
- INTERMEDIATE LOW CONFIDENCE
- SUPPLEMENTARY
- SUPPLEMENTARY LOW CONFIDENCE

Breaklines

- Dual Line Feature
- Single Line Feature
- Soft Hydro Dual Line Feature
- Soft Hydro Single Line Feature
- OVERPASS
- ROADBREAKLINE
- SOFTFEATURE
- ISLAND
- WATERBODY
- COASTALSHORELINE
- LOWCONFIDENCE

Figure 4. Example road feature breaklines and contours from tiles #55772

Bridge and Overpass Features

Bridges and overpasses are correctly captured as three-dimensional breaklines, capturing the edge of pavement on the bridge, rather than the elevation of guard rails or other bridge surfaces. Each vertex maintains vertical integrity. Figure 5 shows example breaklines and contours of bridge and overpass features.




Figure 5. Example bridge and overpass feature breaklines and contours from tile # 57925 & 57926

Soft Features

Soft features such as ridges, valleys, top of banks, etc. are correctly captured as three-dimensional breaklines so as to support better hydrological modeling of the LiDAR data and contours. Each vertex maintains vertical integrity. Figure 6 shows example breaklines and contours of soft features.




Figure 6. Example soft feature breaklines and contours from tile #57380

Island Features

The shoreline of islands within water bodies are correctly captured as two-dimensional breaklines in coastal and/or tidally influenced areas and as three-dimensional breaklines in non-tidally influenced areas for island features one-half acre in size or greater. All natural and man-made islands are depicted as closed polygons with constant elevation. Figure 7 shows example breaklines and contours for island features.




Figure 7. Example island feature breaklines and contours from tile #59456

Low Confidence Areas

The apparent boundary of vegetated areas (1/2 acre or larger) that are considered obscured to the extent that adequate vertical data cannot be clearly determined to accurately define the DTM are correctly captured as two-dimensional features with no z-values. Figure 8 shows example breaklines and contours for low confidence areas.




Figure 8. Example low confidence area feature breaklines and contours from tile #59547

Appendix I: Geodatabase Structure

